

T H B
DOCTRINE

O F

The *Jure-divino-ship* of Hereditary
Indefeasible Monarchy

Enquired into and Exploded,

I N A

LETTER

T O

Mr. THOMAS RUDDIMAN,

Principal Keeper of the Lawyers Library in *Edinburgh*,

F R O M

Mr. GEORGE LOGAN

One of the Ministers of *Edinburgh*.

*Ad generum Cereris sine cede & sanguine pauci
Descendunt Reges, & sicca morte Tyranni.*

JUVENAL. *Saryra Xma.*

EDINBURGH:

Printed by THOMAS LUMSDEN and COMPANY, and sold
by the Booksellers in Town and Country. 1742.

T H E

DOCTRINE

O F

The Jurisdiction of Her Majesty

in the Maritime Monarchy

Enquired into and Exploded

4/

1/2

17

755.

LETTER



MR. THOMAS DUDMAN

of the City of London, in England

FROM

M. GEORGE LOUAIN

One of the Ministers of Education

At the Court of the University of London
in the City of London, in England
JANUARY 1755

EDINBURGH

Printed by Thomas Hamilton and Company, in the City of London, in England

Learned Sir,



YOU are greatly in my Debt: For tho' you have made a very long Answer, such as it is, to my first Treatise on Government; yet my Second Treatise on the same Subject, and my First Part of the Finishing Stroke, or *Mr. Ruddiman Self-condemned*, stand still, without the Shadow of a Reply, tho' you have had sufficient Time to prepare one. As to the 2^d Part of the Finishing Stroke, or *Mr. R——n more Self-condemned*, I frankly own, you have not had Time to make a Reply to it; especially, since a new Antagonist is risen up against you, viz. the Author of the Vindication of *Mr. George Buchanan* in two Parts; a Performance that speaks for itself, and needs not my Recommendation.

In the Finishing Stroke, Part 2^d, I told you, That you, in several Pages of your Answer, labour the *Jure-divino-ship* of hereditary

editary indefeasible Monarchy, to the Exclusion of all other Forms of Civil Government from having any Claim to it; and that because in Finishing Stroke, Part 1st, P. 114—117, I have only considered one of your Texts of Scripture, viz. Psal. lxi. 5. *Thou hast given me the Heritage of those that fear thy Name*; from which you would prove, That the People of Israel were King David's Inheritance, whereas they were God's Inheritance; where I have exposed your Blunders. I then promised, God willing, to try your Strength, by giving my Observations on a great many other Texts, which you have without any Judgment gathered together; so that you shall, within a short Time, hear from me.

And now I am to perform my Promise: And though I have prepared a pretty large Treatise against the Divinity of Monarchy, exclusively of all other Forms and Kinds of Civil Government, as having no just or well-founded Claim to a *Jure-divino-ship*; I shall confine my Letter to the Examination of your Doctrine, that strict hereditary Monarchy is indefeasible and *de jure divino*.

Against your Doctrine, I had proposed, as I think, an Objection of Moment, in the 6th Page of my second Treatise on Government;

vernment; which was, That I cannot be brought to be of the Opinion, that God intended there should be an hereditary indefeasible Succession of Kings, as his Ordinance, unless he would endow them with hereditary Wisdom, Justice, Goodness, and all other necessary Qualifications for the right Administration of the Government. To this you attempt to make a Reply in several Pages of your Answer, especially in Page 391—394, from Reason and Scripture, and P. 136—140.

But, that I may do you Justice, I must previously represent, from your Book, your Sentiments touching the hereditary indefeasible Right of Kings, that it may be evident I do not mistake you, and that I may fix you so closely to what you have published, as to leave you no Room for such shameful Evasions, as I find you often making, for freeing and saving yourself from the Strength of these Considerations that are advanced against you.

In several Passages of your Book you maintain, that the Right to the Crown is strictly and absolutely hereditary by Proximity of Blood; that the next in Blood shall succeed first, if there is a Son, and if there is none, a Daughter. The Consequence of this strict and absolute hereditary Right

is, that it is indefeasible; and so there must be always one of the Royal Blood to succeed; and, in that Moment that one dies, another is King; according to your Maxim, *Rex non moritur*. You maintain, That there is no Interregnum; that, tho' there has been an Interruption, as to the Exercise of the Right, yet the Right itself must still continue in the Person to whom it belonged. By this means the Chevalier has still the Right in his Person, the Acts of both Nations excluding his Father and all his Descendents notwithstanding. These Decisions, according to you (at the Revolution) and the Principles of the Jacobites, made an Interruption only in the Exercise of the Right of King James VII. but the Right itself did continue, whatever Decision might be made to the contrary (a), and his Son, to this Day, is a *Jure-diving* King.

Thus I have given a fair Representation of your Doctrine; And yet you betrayed this Cause, and was manifestly inconsistent with yourself, when the following Words drop'd from your Pen; viz, That once the hereditary Right was broken and interrupted, when the absolute Necessity of our Affairs seemed to require

(a) Ans. P. 141, 142.

it. Your Phrase, *Absolute Necessity of Affairs* seemed to require it, is exceedingly strange; for I know no Case that requires it more, than that of absolute Necessity.

A certain Gentleman directed a Missive, in the *Scots Magazine* for the Month of *February An. 1748*, to the Author; wherein he pretends to give Aid to Mr. R——n, and serve his Cause. This Letter I have examined (b), and made it evident, That he does not understand the Controversy; that he grossly contradicts himself, and at last yields up the Cause, by asserting, *That he knows no good Cause for believing, that any King now a-days has a divine Right to a Crown.* Thus he abandon'd all the Jacobites, who believe and openly profess, That the Chevalier has a divine hereditary Right to the Kingdoms of *Scotland, England and Ireland.* I hope you have considered what I have reply'd to the said Missive.

And now I proceed, Sir, to take under my Review and Examination, what you are pleased to advance in Reply to my fore-said Objection to the pretended *Jure-divino-ship* of the hereditary indefeasible Right of Monarchy. You say (c), That you will not launch out into a critical Disquisition

(b) *Finish. Stroke, Part I. P. 159—167.* (c) *Answ. P. 391.*

tion concerning that Matter: But what you
 was to say upon it, you reduce to Six Con-
 siderations, or Topicks, from Reason and
 Scripture, which you think are a sufficient
 Answer to my Objection to the *Jure-divino*
ship of hereditary indefeasible or indefec-
 tible Monarchy. And here I do profess,
 that your Six Topicks, or Arguments, have
 not the least Influence to convince me, that
 there is a divine Ordinance for the said
 Right; as if the eldest Son of a King, or
 the next in Blood, had always been distin-
 guished from the rest of his Brethren, by
 more than ordinary Endowments both of
 Body and Mind, fitting him for Govern-
 ment; this being contrary to Fact and
 common Observation, for which I refer
 you to the Histories of ancient and modern
 Kingdoms.—I had proposed my Objection
 to the said Right, in the Dedication of my
 2^d Treatise on Government: But you do
 not engage with it, till you draw near to
 the End of your voluminous Dissertation.
 Had you consulted your own Reputation,
 you had done better to have let it pass
 without any Reply, as you have done
 many other Things in this Debate, to
 which you was not able to give an Answer.
 For the most of your Six Topicks, in-
 stead of being solid and convincing Ar-
 guments,

guments, are nothing but bold and unsupported Assertions: But you mistake yourself greatly, if you think, that your Authority is so much to be regarded.

I know very well that some of your Friends have said, that in my former Performances on Government, and the pretended strict Hereditary Right of our Kings, I was acting out of my Sphere and Province, when I interested myself in this Question. In this they copy from Sir George Mackenzie's *Jus Regium*, wherein he finds Fault with the Clergy for writing on this Subject, wherein the Knowledge of the Laws is necessary: But why may not we Clergymen, being the King's Subjects, in order to our giving Obedience to the Laws ourselves, and recommending it to our People, by the most prevailing Arguments, employ some of our spare Hours in this Study, and write upon this Subject, *pro nostro modulo*? I submit it to the Judgment of the Gentlemen of the Long Robe, whether it is not as proper for us, to write on a Subject wherein the Law is concerned, as is was for *Lesly* the Popish Bishop of *Ross*, and *Spotswood* Archbishop of *St. Andrews*, to be Presidents of the Courts of Session, and Six other Bishops to be Lords of Council and Session, in *Scotland*, and 28

Bishops, Lords Spiritual, to sit and judge in *England*, in all Causes that come before that supreme Court.

But now you'll be perswaded that I am acting in Character, when I am writing on the *Jure-divino-ship* of hereditary indefectible Monarchy: You, tho' a Layman, write on this Subject; but I shall never quarrel an Antiquary, a Lawyer, or any other learned Person, as an Interloper in this Part of the Argument: For, as I will not believe any Thing to be Law, purely because this or the other Lawyer says it is Law; so I do not claim that any should rely implicitly on my Opinion and Judgment, in this Debate, any further than I support it with Scripture and Reason: Nay, I rather invite them to examine and canvass what I advance upon it; and promise to make my grateful Acknowledgments to any Layman that shall set me right, wherein I may chance to fall into a Mistake or Error.

The Method I propose to be observed, is, *first*, To shew the Insufficiency of the Six Topicks or Arguments you bring, in p. 391—394, for answering my Objection to your Doctrine. *2dly*, To consider a great Number of Texts of Scripture, you have, without Judgment, gathered together
for

for establishing your Doctrine of the *Jure-divino-ship* of hereditary indefeasible Monarchy, p. 136--140.

PART I. In which I propose to shew the Insufficiency of the Six Topicks you bring, to be an Answer to the Objection I made to your Doctrine of the *Jure-divino-ship* of hereditary indefeasible Monarchy.

Your *first* Argument is, "That it seems to be evident from Holy Writ, that Monarchical Government, first in Families, and afterwards in Nations and Kingdoms, and that transmitted by hereditary Succession, was the only Government that Almighty God did primarily institute and appoint to be kept up in the World!"

But the Time when, is not told, when God appointed Monarchical Government to be set up, or to be kept up, in the World.

In this and the five following Considerations, you come to a positive Determination, and attempt to prove, that hereditary Monarchy is of Divine Institution, tho', in p. 129. you decline to enter into the Dispute, whether Kings derive their Power from God alone, or from the People? and your Reason is, that it seems still to be *sub judice*. Did you not enter into the

Dispute, when (*d*) you say, that you are sure, that in the Kingdom of *Judah*, the Rule of Succession was appointed by God? And afterwards, in several Pages (*e*), you must a great many Passages of Scripture to prove hereditary Monarchy to be *jure divino*. And are not your Six Topicks, advanced by you towards the close of your Book (*f*), an Evidence that you have entered far into the Dispute?

You say, *That Monarchical Government was first instituted in Families*. Monarchical Government is the Government of one Person over others, according to the Import of the Word; but the Government that God first instituted, was *poteslas maritalis*, conjugal Authority, the Authority of a Husband over a Wife. If it may be said, that before the Fall *Eve* was properly a Subject to *Adam*, she seems then to be his Equal, and joint with him in the federal Representation of Mankind, as she was to be the Mother of all Living; and it seems that her Subjection to *Adam* was the Effect of her being first in the Transgression, and of her tempting and enticing of him to eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. It was a Punishment inflicted

(*d*) Ans. P. 96. (*e*) Ans. P. 136—140. (*f*) Ans. P. 391—394.

afflicted upon her by God himself (g), *Thy Desire shall be to thy Husband* (Marg. thou shalt be subject to thy Husband) and *he shall rule over thee.* But be it so, that in the State of Innocence Eve was a Subject, your Argument from this is but trifling, for proving Monarchy to be a divine Institution, and a playing upon the Word, that the first Man, that one Man had Dominion in the first State over one, and but one Woman: And it doth not appear, that in the State of Innocence he exercised any Act of Authority or Dominion over her. The next Government then of Divine Institution, is, *potestas parentalis*, the Government of Parents; and this comprehends paternal and maternal Government, according to that moral, natural Precept (h), *Honour thy Father and thy Mother, that thy Days may be long in the Land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee.* But this being the Authority of Two over others, is not a Monarchy in the strict Acceptation of the Word. By this Law, the Mother had the Right of Dominion and Government over Children as well as the Father; she had a Right to command, and it was the Duty of her Children to be subject and obedient to her; So that if Adam was a

(g) Gen. iii, 16. (h) Exod. xx. 12.

Monarch over Children, *Eve* was a Queen over them. If you argue for the Divinity of Monarchy, I fear you are still trifling: For I ever thought, and I believe Everybody thinks, that Monarchy is the Government of one Person over a great Number of Subjects. It was a good Time before there were so many Families, as to make up a Kingdom.

There is also *poteſtas herilis*, the Authority of a Master over Servants: And I believe, that ſo ſoon as this commenced, the Miſtreſs of the Family had her Share of this Authority; the Maſter not having the whole Authority in his Perſon, his Authority cannot, ſtrictly ſpeaking, be called a Monarchy. This Authority of a Maſter over Servants, was firſt introduced into the World, either by Poverty, and that could not take place as long as there were but few to people the World; or by Conqueſt and Tyranny, making thoſe they conquered to be their Servants and Slaves. I ſuppoſe you will find it difficult to fix the Time when this Kind of Government was firſt appointed; ſurely it muſt have been a long Time after the Beginning of the World.

You ſay, "That Monarchy was afterwards in Nations and Kingdoms;" Not in Kingdoms,

doms, in the Plural Number, for a long Time: For I suppose, that you maintain, with Sir *Robert Filmer*, That *Adam* before the Flood, and *Noah* after it, were the sole and universal Monarchs of the World. We commonly speak of the Patriarchs before the Flood; and you'll oblige the World by shewing, when *Adam* quit so much of his Authority, as to make other Kingdoms besides his own Kingdom. I own, that *Cain* seems to have had a separate Authority; But was this by divine Institution?

You hold, that Monarchy was afterwards in Nations and Kingdoms: But, Sir, Monarchy was never but in a Kingdom, properly speaking; for a King and Kingdom are *correlata*. I cannot form to myself the Idea of a King, without having at the same Time the Notion of a Kingdom.

You again, Sir, assert, That Monarchy, transmitted by hereditary Succession, was the only Government that God Almighty did primarily institute. Had you said, that God instituted that Monarchy should be transmitted by hereditary Succession, there is Sense in it; but it is destitute of all Proof; it is *gratis dictum*: To say, that Monarchy, transmitted by hereditary Succession, is of divine Institution, is what I cannot comprehend. Was not hereditary Monarchy first
in-

instituted, before it could be transmitted by Succession? How can you shew that it was not instituted, till it was transmitted by Succession? For *Adam* had not a Successor for the Space of 930 Years. You say, "That Monarchy, thus transmitted, was the only Government of divine Institution." But was this instituted, so as to exclude all other Forms of Government from having any Warrant or Ground for them; and so as to be obliging upon all Societies and Communities of Men for ever in the World? The World will be obliged to you for this Discovery, and for directing us where and when God did deliver such an Institution. If there was such a divine Institution, that Monarchy should be transmitted by hereditary Succession, God must have acted contrary to his own Institution and Ordinance, by pointing out *Saul* first to be King over *Israel*, afterwards *David*, and next *Solomon*. None of them had the hereditary Right, neither was it transmitted to them by hereditary Succession. These three Kings you own to be *Jure-divino* Kings; but the Kingdom came not to them by hereditary Succession.

Your *second* Topick or Argument is, "That as the Sovereign, all-wise and all-good Being designs the Happiness of all
his

" his Creatures, and especially of publick
 " Societies and Communities of Men ; so,
 " if he did institute any Form of Govern-
 " ment, it is reasonable to think it would
 " be that which is best fitted for promoting
 " that End ; and that the Government you
 " are speaking of is such, and preferable to
 " all others, is confirmed by the Experience
 " of all Ages." In this we have not the
 least Appearance of Argument ; we have
 nothing but an idle Supposition, and some
 unsupported Assertions in place of Proof.
 I say, we have an idle Supposition, which
 is the Matter in Debate and Question ; a
 Supposition of God's instituting a certain par-
 ticular Form of Civil Government, that shall
 be binding on all Societies and Communi-
 ties of Men, to the Exclusion of all other
 Forms of it. This is what the best and
 the most knowing Writers on Civil Go-
 vernment absolutely deny ; and is what I
 will never yield to you, till I see stronger Ar-
 guments than those that you have produ-
 ced. As to a Form of Civil Government,
 whether Monarchical, Aristocratical or De-
 mocratical, or any Form that is a Mixture
 of these ; I refuse it, that God has institu-
 ted one of these to be binding upon the
 Societies and Communities of Men : And
 I hold and maintain, That God has left it

to the Wisdom of human Societies to chuse and fix upon that Form that best suits with them, and their Circumstances, and to make Improvements upon it, nay to change and alter it, for a Form that they may think to be better.

Again, Upon the foresaid Supposition, that God has instituted a Form, &c. you say, it is reasonable to think it would be that which is best fitted for promoting, *1st*, The Happiness of all his Creatures; and *2^{dly}*, Especially the Happiness of the Societies and Communities of Men; as if God had designed to provide a Form of Government, to promote the Happiness of all these Beings and Creatures, that are distinct from human Societies; such as, the brutal World, the Beasts of the Field, the Fowls of the Air, the Fishes of the Sea, and the vast Variety there is of each of these Kinds, that each of these are under a Monarchical Government: So that each of the foresaid Denominations, must have a Monarch or King. But, Sir, these Creatures know not what Government means; the strongest of them, whom you will call Monarchs, have no Inclination to govern; I say to govern, but to bear hard upon the weaker; as the Lion, to tear and devour the weaker Beasts; the Eagle, to tear and de-

devour the weaker Fowls ; and the Whale to swallow up and devour the lesser Fishes : And, if this is an Argument to prove any Thing at all, it will be an Argument calculated for supporting the Tyranny and Cruelty of absolute Monarchs ; but then, God has formed the rest of these Animals to make Resistance for their Preservation, by their Cunning, their Swiftnes, their Numbers, and their contemptible Littleness. According to you, one Beast has a Monarchy over all Beasts ; and because there are many Species of them, nay, a vast Variety of them, each must have a King ; and so on, among the many Thousand Kinds of Fowls, of Fishes, nay, of Insects, in the different Parts of the Earth. I read in Scripture, that God gave to Man a Dominion over these Creatures (1), for he said, *Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness ; and let them have Dominion over the Fish of the Sea, and over the Fowl of the Air, and over the Cattle, and over all the Earth, and over every creeping Thing that creepeth upon the Earth. Let them have Dominion, i. e. the Male and Female of the human Kind, Adam and Eve ; the Dominion was given to both ; It was not lodged in the Hands of one*

(i) Gen. i. 26,

C 2

of

11. 10. 1944

of them, but of both. So that there was a King and Queen over all the foresaid Kinds of Creatures. God qualified them in their Creation for a Dominion over these inferior Creatures, as he made them *wiser than the Beasts of the Earth, and the Fowls of Heaven* (k). This Dominion would have been conveyed to their Posterity, had they continued in their Innocence and Obedience to God. I shall not here stay to explain this Dominion and Government, our original Parents in their Creation had over them; but it is certain, that by Reason of the Fall it is much impaired: And it is certain, that in Scripture we read nothing of any Monarchy or Government, that one Lion has over all other Lions, and all other Beasts; nor of one Eagle, over all other Eagles, and all other Fowls; nor of one Whale, over all other Whales, and all other Fishes. You'll oblige the World by explaining this Monarchical Dominion and Government; but I despair of ever seeing this done.

Again, you say, "That Monarchy is best fitted for promoting the Happiness of all God's Creatures." Now, since you distinguish this general from the Societies and Communities of Men, I have a strong

(k) Job xxxv. 11.

strong Apprehension, that it is your Sentiment, that the Angels are under an Angelical Monarchical Government. As to this, there is no Question but the Angels, being God's Creatures, are under the divine Dominion and Government; nay, I am of the Sentiment, that there was an Order among them at their Creation, and that there is still an Order among them; for their Almighty Creator is *not the God of Confusion, but of Order*: But what that Order is, is not revealed to us. And tho' they are under the Government of God, the great Governor of the World, yet it does not appear, that any one Angel has a Monarchical Government over the rest. The *Platonists* maintained three Orders of Demons (whom we call Angels) *viz.* super-celestial, celestial and subcelestial; but to these different Kinds, others have multiplied the Kinds of Angels. *Dionysius, Areopagita*, (not that *Dionysius* of whom the Apostle *Paul* speaks, *Acts* xvii. 34. but one of that Name in the 3d Century) wrote concerning the Hierarchies of Angels; no less than three of them: And under the first Hierarchy he reckons Seraphims, Cherubims and Thrones; under the second he reckons Dominations, Virtues and Authorities; and under the third he reckons

Prin-

Principalities, Archangels and Angels. He is followed by *Damascen*, and after him, by *Thomas Aquinas*, and the Generality of the Schoolmen: But all this, concerning their Order, has no Foundation in Scripture; it is the pure Invention of their idle Heads. There are Angels good and bad. As to the good Angels, who continued firm in their Obedience to their Almighty Creator, and who have been long in a confirmed State of Happiness, they are under the Dominion and Government of God their Maker (l): *He maketh his Angels Spirits, and his Ministers a Flame of Fire*: Of them it is said (m), *That they are all ministring Spirits, sent forth (by God) to minister to them who shall be Heirs of Salvation*: They constantly attend his Throne, and receiving his Commands, *they do them, they do his Pleasure* (n): They are likewise under the Government and Authority of JESUS CHRIST; For when God did bring his First-begotten into the World, he saith, *Let all the Angels of God worship him* (o): And the Apostle Peter acquaints us (p), *That Jesus Christ is gone into Heaven, and is on the Right-hand of God, Angels, and Authorities, and Powers being made subject to him*. But there

(l) Heb. i. 7. (m) v. 14. (n) Psal. ciii. 20, 21.
 (o) Heb. i. 6. (p) 1 Ep. iii. 22.

is no Reason to think, That, to promote their Happiness, they are subjected to the Authority of any one created Angel, or that he as a Monarch presides over them. As all Souls are equal in their Nature, Powers, Faculties and Properties; so it is with these Angels: There is no such Inequality among them, as that is, of a Monarch above all the rest, from whom they receive Laws; but they are immediately under the Authority of God, their King. When, in the holy Scriptures, we read of an Archangel, it is not to be thought, that he has any Dominion or Authority given to him over the other good Angels: But, as I conceive, it is upon the account of some extraordinary Work God employs him in. Thus we are told, That, when the Dead, at the End of the World, shall be raised to Life, *the Voice of the Archangel, and the Trump of God, shall be heard.* There is also one *Michael*, called the Archangel (q), because of the special Commission given him to contend with the Devil about the Body of *Moses*. The good Angels are entrusted with a Dominion over Men, which they exercise in a Way invisible and unknown to us; and, no doubt, have Wisdom and Power superior to that of Devils: But that

(q) Jude v. 9.

that any of them presides, as a Monarch or King, over the other good Angels, I see no Foundation for it in the Word of God.

And now, as to bad Angels: We indeed read of the Devil and his Angels (r), and of *Beelzebub* the Prince of Devils (s): As he was the Ring-leader of their Rebellion against God, and is called *Satan*; and the Hebrew Name *Baalzebub* signifies, the Lord of Flies; and how he came to have this Name, I leave it to your Conjecture. These wicked Beings are under the divine Government and *Regimen*, permitting them to be the Executioners of His vindictive Justice, and limiting and restraining their Power and Wrath against good Men, not suffering them to do all that Evil against them, that they are inclined to. The Devil is stiled, *The God of this World*, having usurped a Dominion over it, and God permitting it, partly for the Trial of the Graces of good Men, and partly, for inflicting Judgments on the Wicked: But that any one of them is a Monarch over the rest, I can't see there is any Foundation for it; and I am sure that God does Nothing to promote their Happiness, for at present *they are reserved in everlasting Chains*.

(r) Matth. xxv. 41. (s) Matth. xii. 25

of Darkneſs, to the Judgment of the great Day (1), when they ſhall have a ſorer Punishment inflicted upon them, than what at preſent they ſuffer.

You, Sir, are well acquainted and very learned in the Heathen Poets, who make mention of many Kinds of Devils, or evil Demons; as the *Sylvani*, *Fauni*, *Satyri*, *Panes*, *Nymphae*, *Naiades*, *Neriedes*, &c. but I do not find, that they aſſert a Monarchical Government among them; but if there is, you, of all Men I know, are capable to give us the Hiſtory of their Government.

You add, on this Head, That Monarchy is beſt fitted to promote the Happineſs, eſpecially of the Societies and Communities of Men. I am of the Sentiments, that a limited and well regulated hereditary Monarchy is the beſt Civil Form of Government: The Benefits and Happineſs of this we enjoy in *Britain*; May this great Bleſſing be tranſmitted to Poſterity, in the ſucceſſive Deſcendents from the preſent Royal Family: Yet I cannot be brought to think, that there is a divine Inſtitution of this Form, to the Excluſion of all other Forms. But your Opinion is, That the Monarchy that is ſtrictly and abſolutely hereditary, is

(1) Jude v. 6.

the best Civil Government for promoting the wordly Felicity of the Societies and Communities of Men. Herein I shall for ever differ from you, for it never fails to promote all Kinds of Miseries to them, and very often to such absolute Monarchs themselves: For this Reason I did chuse the Motto in the Title Page, out of *Juvenal's Tenth Satyre*;

*Ad generam Cereris sine cæde & sanguine pauci
Descendunt Reges, & sicca morte Tyranni.*

The Note of *Jo. Britannicus* on this is, *Non mirum hos omnes tam crudeliter casos, pauci enim sunt Tyranni, qui ferro non pereant.* By gener *Cereris* is meant *Pluto*, who ravished *Proserpina*: The Poets call him the God of Hell: They say, that *Jupiter* begat *Proserpina* on *Ceres*; whom *Pluto* the infernal god ravished, and took with him into his infernal Kingdom. You see where *Juvenal* sends Tyrants, and absolute Monarchs are Tyrants. I need not to give any other Instance of the Miseries under an absolute and despotick Monarchy, than the Kingdom of *France*. It shall be my fervent Prayer to God, Lord, pity the People that are under it; and that the glorious Liberty of *Britons*, my never be changed for Slavery and Tyranny.

You

You conclude this Topick by a bold, but false, Assertion, "That Monarchy is confirmed, by the Experience of all Ages, to be best fitted to promote the Happiness of publick Societies." The *Israelites* indeed proposed Happiness to themselves by having a visible King, for they rejected the KING eternal, immortal, invisible, from being their King; they said to Samuel, 1 Sam. viii. 6. *Make us a King to judge us like all the Nations.* This God interpreted to be a rejecting or degrading of him from the Government over them, v. 7. But Samuel had the divine Command laid upon him, to protest solemnly to them, and to shew them the Manner of the King that shall reign over them, v. 9. Accordingly, in Obedience to this Command, he told them all the Words of God, v. 10-19. by which he shewed they should have Experience of their King's promoting their Unhappiness and Misery. He said, *This will be the Manner of the King that shall reign over you: He will take your Sons, and appoint them for himself, for his Chariots, and to be his Horsemen, and some shall run before his Chariots. And he will appoint him Captains over Thousands, and Captains over Fifties, and will see them to ear his Ground, and to reap his Harvest, and to make his Instruments of War, and In-*

Instruments of his Chariots. And he will take your Daughters to be Confectionaries, and to be Cooks, and to be Bakers. And he will take your Fields, and your Vineyards, and your Oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his Servants. And he will take the Tenth of your Seed, and of your Vineyards, and give to his Officers, and to his Servants. And he will take your Men-servants, and your Maid-servants, and your goodliest young Men, and your Asses, and put them to his Work. He will take the Tenth of your Sheep; and ye shall be his Servants. He tells them, that this will be most miserable and oppressive; so that they shall cry out in that Day because of their King, which they shall have chosen them: And the Lord will not hear them in that Day. Besides, there was not so much as one of the Kings of Israel that promoted their Happiness; and many of the Kings of Judah promoted it as little: And God was at last provoked to bring the Monarchy of both to an End. It now appears, that the Experience of all Ages does not confirm your bold and false Assertion.

And, Sir, have the Dutch, the Venetians, the Genoesse, the Cantons of Switzerland, and other Republicks, this Experience. Their Experience is to the contrary for many Ages: The Experience of Nations being

being so various and different, it can be no Proof, that this particular Form of Government is best fitted to promote the Happiness of Civil Societies in all Nations of the World.

Asto your *Third* Topick, you say, "That which strengthens your *2d* Topick, to a very high Degree, is, That from the Beginning, and as far as we can trace the Original of Nations, that Form of Government was the only one that obtained in the World some Thousands of Years, before any other was invented or thought of, and has generally prevailed ever since, to this Day." This Topick is taken from Antiquity; and you pretend to account for it, by telling us, That this Form was from the Beginning, and as soon as there were Nations in the World. Now, there is a Twofold Beginning of the World; 1st, From the Creation of the World, it began by *Adam* and *Eve*; 2^{dly}, After the Deluge, it began by *Noah* and his three Sons. In this Topick we have nothing but mere unsupported Assertions instead of Argument: As to the first Beginning of the World by *Adam* and *Eve*, you produce no Scripture Authority to prove, that hereditary Monarchy was instituted from that Beginning. Had there
 been

been any such divine Institution then, it is not to be imagined, that *Moses* would have omitted it, in so long a Period as 1600 Years. *Filmer* (u) maintains, That *Adam* was the universal Monarch of the World, while he lived; but it did not descend to *Cain* his First-born, for he says, That *Adam* forfeited him; But what Foundation has he for this? It did not descend to *Abel* his second Son, for he was barbarously murdered before the Death of his Father, by *Cain* his wicked Brother.—It must then have descended to *Seth*, who indeed outlived *Adam*; but did not succeed to the Catholick Empire, for *Cain*, in his Father's Lifetime, possessed a Part of it. It is said (x), That he dwelt in the Land of Nod, and built a City, which he called *Enoch*, after the Name of his Son. His Posterity are reckoned up by *Moses* (z) to the 7th Generation, who surely were not the Subjects of *Seth's* Kingdom. Tho' *Seth* outlived *Adam*, yet he did not succeed, at *Adam's* Death, as Heir of the whole World; for the Posterity of *Cain* would never own him as such; and I make no Question, but, at *Adam's* Death, *Cain's* Posterity had as large Possessions as these of *Seth*: They were Men of this World,

(u) Patriarcha, P. iv. 17—23.

(x) Gen. iv. 16, 17.

(z) Ch.

World, who had their Portion in this Life (a) and, to this Day, the worst of Men have the largest Dominions and Empires in this World. It was so before the Flood; and because all Flesh had corrupted their Ways, and the Wickedness of Man was great upon the Earth, therefore God punished them with universal Destruction. You may judge, Sir, how the Happiness of the Societies and Communities of Men was promoted by Monarchical Government: They were extremely bad, more than a Hundred Years before the Flood; and though, for a Trial, God granted a Respite for an Hundred Years, yet, instead of becoming better, they grew worse. Judge now, Sir, if your Assertion will hold good, That the Experience of all Ages doth confirm it, that Monarchy was best fitted to promote the Happiness of the Communities of Men.

The second Beginning of the World of Mankind was after the Flood, by *Noah* and his Sons. *Filmer* makes *Noah* the Universal Monarch of the World during his Life, that is, for the Space of 350 Years; Now, you'll be pleased to acquaint me, if this universal Monarchy was hereditary by Proximity of Blood, and the Right of Pri-

(a) Psal. xvii. 14.

Primogeniture, who was his Heir, and which of his Sons was the eldest, and did succeed him; for I cannot find that he had any Successor in the universal Monarchy. It is indeed said, *Gen. v. 32. That Noah was 500 Years old, and begat* [i. e. began to beget; for they were not all born in one Year, *Ham* being called the younger, and *Japhet* the elder.] *Shem, Ham, and Japheth*; that is, he begat these Sons after he was 500 Years old. But these Words do not shew us the natural Order of their Birth; for tho' *Ham* is mentioned in the second Place before *Japheth*, yet he was not the second Son, but his youngest Son; for we read *(b)*, that *Ham the Father of Canaan saw his Father's Nakedness, and told his two Brethren without*; and that *Noah awoke from his Wine, and knew what his younger Son (i. e. Ham his youngest Son) had done unto him*. *Filmer* makes *Shem* to have been the eldest Son, and affirms, that, by his Will and Testament, he left at his Death to him the universal Monarchy of the World. But this is a most precarious Hypothesis; for I much question, if the making of Testaments did obtain so early; and I am sure that no such Testament can be instructed from the sacred Writings. It is indeed the Sen-

(b) *Gen. ix. 22, 24.*

Sentiment of *Austin*, and of these Fathers that follow the Vulgar Version of the Old Testament, that *Shem* was *Noah's* eldest Son ; for, according to that Translation of *Gen. x. 21.* the Words run thus : *Shem frater Japhet majore ; i. e. Shem the elder Brother of Japheth.* But *Chrysostom*, and the Fathers of the Greek Church who follow the Septuagint Translation, make *Japheth* the eldest Son ; for the Words are, *Kai to autogēn ēymōn ē autō, pēlei paratō tōn hōn* Εβραϊστί. ἀδελφὸν ἰαφὲθ τὸ μᾶλλον. With this our Translation agrees ; Unto *Shem* also, the Father of all the Children of *Eber*, the Brother of *Japheth* the elder, even to him were Children born. I would fain know how this Controversy, whether *Shem* or *Japheth* was the eldest Son of *Noah*, can be decided from this Text, since these most ancient Translations of the Old Testament differ so greatly ; especially, when nothing can be certainly concluded from the Order in which the Three Sons of *Noah* is set down : For, as I observed already, that *Ham* is set down as the second Son in *Gen. v. 32.* — *ix. 18.* and *x. 1.* yet *Ham* is called the youngest, *Gen. ix. 24.* And tho' *Shem* is placed first in all these Texts ; yet when *Moses* is to give the Account of the Descendents from each, he gives us first the

Posterity of *Japheth*, *Gen. x. 2.--6.* the
 Sons of *Ham* next, *ver. 6.--22.* and last of
 all, the Sons of *Shem*, *ver. 22--end.* Now,
 if you agree with the *LXX.* our Trans-
 lation, and several others, which make
Japheth the eldest, then the Scheme of
 your Friend Sir *Robert Filmer* falls to no-
 thing, and the hereditary Right did not
 go to *Shem*. But if you agree with the
 Vulgar, the *LXX* Translation, our own,
 and also of many other Translations, as
 that of *Junius* and *Tremellius*, is not to be
 regarded. I find that some argue for the
 Primogeniture of *Shem*, because of the
 Words of *Noah*, *Gen. ix. 26. Blessed be the*
Lord God of Shem. ver. 27. God shall en-
large Japheth (marg. perswade) and he
shall dwell in the Tents of Shem. But tho'
Shem is first mentioned in *Noah's* Benedic-
 tion, it doth not follow that he was his el-
 dest Son; but he is first mentioned, because
 he seems to have been the first Mover for
 doing the Honour of covering his Father's
 Nakedness; and therefore it is said, *ver. 23.*
That Shem and Japheth took a Garment, and
laid it upon both their Shoulders, and went
backwards, and covered the Nakedness of their
Father. And likewise, because the *Messias*
 was to descend from his Loins (which is
 no Argument that he was eldest Son; for
 the

the Messiah was to descend from *Judah*, *Jacob's* 4th Son) and because his Posterity were to be the true Church: For it seems that *Japheth's* Posterity, for a Time, made a Defection from it; but God afterward, by Persuasion, was to make them return to the true Church, or inhabit the Tents of *Shem*. So that this is an early Prediction of the calling of the *Gentiles*.

Since it seems to be plain now, that *Shem* was not the eldest Son of *Noah*, the universal hereditary Monarchy of the World did not descend to him: It would rather seem, that since there was the wide World to be possess'd, that each of them had a large Share; and thus the universal Monarchy of the World came to an End: So that this universal Monarchy did not obtain for some Thousands of Years, as you maintain.

But supposing that *Shem* had the Right in his own Person, how long, pray you, did he enjoy it? It would seem that he outlived it: For we read, that in the Days of *Peleg*, a Descendent of *Shem*, the Earth was divided among the Children of Men that were to inhabit it. This is the Import of his Name, as we are told by *Moses*, *Gen. x. 25. That unto Eber were born two Sons, the Name of the one was Peleg, for in*

his Days was the Earth divided; that is, about the Time of his Birth: For this is the Reason of calling him by that Name. Now we are told, Gen. xi. 10. that *Shem* was an hundred Years old, and begat *Arphaxad*, two Years after the Flood; and ver. 12. that *Arphaxad* lived 35 Years and begat *Salah*; and ver. 14. that *Salah* lived 30 Years and begat *Eber*; and ver. 16. that *Eber* lived 34 Years, and begat *Peleg*. If you'll be pleased to add these Years, of the Descendants of *Shem*, after the Flood, till the Birth of *Peleg*, you'll find that the Total amounts only to 101. If then the Earth was divided to the Children of Men, and given to 70 Heads, or Kings, as no Doubt you will call them, does not this put an End to the universal Monarchy of *Noah*. Now *Noah* was 600 Years old in the 1656 when the Flood came on, and the Earth was divided into 70 particular Kingdoms, (as no Doubt you will call them) about the 101 Year after the Flood: Now *Noah* lived a long Time after this; so that the universal hereditary Monarchy did not obtain in the World for some Thousands of Years. This is your Assertion, for you must be understood of that kind of Monarchy, otherwise your third Topick is not against the Objection that I made to the hereditary

indefeasible Right of Kings, being *De jure divino*.

But let me consider who he was that made this Division. Did *Noah* divide the Earth into 70 Kingdoms, as *Joshua* divided the Land of *Canaan* by Lot; if so, then *Noah* with his own Hand denuded himself of this universal Empire; or, did God the only universal Ruler and Lord of Heaven and Earth, in a Way of vindictive and punishing Justice divide it by the Confusion of Tongues; for it is thought, that there were no less than 70 different Languages, by which these 70 Nations were kept distinct from each other. And if this was the Case, then in *Noah's* own Days, a Period was put to his universal Monarchy; for he lived no less than 350 Years after the Flood (c): But the Earth, according to *Filmer's* Scheme, was divided into 70 independent Kingdoms at the Confusion of Tongues, in the 101 Year after the Flood. Now add 101 Years to 1600, the Years of the universal Monarchy, from the first Beginning of the World, will be only 1701; or if you compute, as others, the Deluge to have been Anno 1656, by adding 101 to these Years, the Number will come out to be 1757. How then will you bring it

(c) Gen. ix. 28.

out, that this universal Monarchy obtained in the World for some Thousands of Years.

You must therefore desert Sir Robert's Principles, and say that lesser hereditary Monarchies obtained in the World for some Thousands of Years, and that these came in the 1701 Year of the World, in the Room of the universal hereditary Monarchy; so that this universal hereditary Monarchy was not indefeasible. Thus it appears, that your Third Topick can be no Answer to my Objection, to which you did undertake to make a Reply: But of your lesser hereditary Monarchies more afterwards.

I hope you will be convinced, that the universal hereditary Monarchy of the World, has been lost for some Thousands of Years, ever since the 1701 Year of the World. Will you now have the Assurance to advance your sham Evasion, which you do with respect to our *Scottish* Kings, that the Exercise of the Right was interrupted, but the Right itself still remained after the Year foresaid. You'll be so good as to inform me, who is that great Man with whom that Right doth remain; where he lives, whether in *Europe*, or in any other of the three great Parts of the Universe? To what Place will you go to ask? Where

is he that is born King of the Universe, that you may pay civil Homage to him? Will you entertain such an chymical Hope, as to expect you'll find one, that can deduce his Original from Noah, the last universal Monarch of the World. Mr. Lesly (*d*) says, that, in this Case, the People are the Judges, who has the Proximity of Blood; but if they shall differ in their Sentiments (for it is ridiculous to think, that they will be all of the same Mind) whether will the Decision be by the Vote, or by the Sword? Not by the Vote, for I apprehend they will vote blindly, thro' the Want of early Records, the Revolutions of Nations and Kingdoms (which cuts off the hereditary Succession) and the Distance of Time, these are Impediments of coming to the certain Knowledge of the lineal Descent; the Vote will be, as every one affirms, without any good Reason for it. Or must the Decision be by the Sword? but as it is impossible to assemble the whole World in a general Council to vote, either themselves, or by their Representatives; so it is as impossible to muster Armies of all the fighting Men in the World, to give a Decision by Battel. By this Means the *Major vis* will decide it, and

(*d*) Rehearsal, Numb. 6.

and the World will be an *Aceldama*, a Field of Blood ; and by the former, the Monarch will be elective.

I shall now bring you down to the Confusion of Tongues, and the Division of the Earth, which was long before the Death of *Noah*, at which Time there was a general Defection and Apostasy. Impiety arrived at a great Height in the Space of 101 Years, when *Noah* was universal Monarch: But how doth it appear to be Truth what you asserted in your Second Topick, that Monarchy is best settled for promoting the Happiness of the Societies and Communities of Men ; for under the Reign of so good a King as *Noah*, his Subjects were presumptuously wicked, they were in a Plot to wage War with Heaven: This was their daring Resolution (*e*), *Go to, let us build us a City, and a Tower, whose Top may reach unto Heaven, and let us make us a Name.* This speaks a Defiance of the Almighty. This City was to be the Metropolis of their Kingdom, aiming at an universal Monarchy, but God dispersed and scattered them, by confounding their Language, tho' they all were of one Language before ; so that they should not understand one another: He miraculously made

(*e*) Gen. xi. 4.

made them to forget their former Language; and each Tribe of the 70 had a peculiar Language to itself, which they of that Tribe only understood.

I suppose that you will maintain with Mr. *Hudson* (a prodigious Stickler for the Divinity of Monarchy) and other *Jure-divino* Monarchy Men, that these 70, among whom the Earth was divided, came to their Thrones and Kingdoms by an hereditary Right or Proximity of Blood: This *Hudson* expressly asserts, that they all enjoyed the Honour by Birth-right (f); but directly contrary to *Moses* his Narration: For *Nimrod*, the Son of *Cush*, and the Grandson of *Ham*, is the only Person of the 70 that is said to have a Kingdom (g); he was the sixth Son of *Cush*, and consequently could not have the Right of Primogeniture; he got it by Violence, Oppression and Conquest; he is called a mighty Hunter before the Lord; i. e. a grand Persecuter; and from him the proverbial Phrase, describing Tyrants, took its rise, *Wherefore it is said, even as Nimrod, the mighty Hunter before the Lord*. By his Hunting he came to acquire a Kingdom; Will this recommend Monarchy as the fittest Form of Government to promote the

F

Hap

(f) Div. Right of Gov. p. 122. (g) Gen. x. 9, 10.

Happiness of the Societies of Men? And now, when I have traced the Original of Nations up to him, did he come to his Monarchy by the Right of Primogeniture?

I shall now come further down, and try if it can be made out, that strict hereditary Monarchy did obtain in the World from the Confusion of Tongues; by which I think you mean, that there was no other civil Governments in the World, than Monarchy: And I hope that you'll agree, that the sacred Writings are the only sure Rule we have to come to the Knowledge of this. I come down to *Terah*, who was the Seventh in Succession from *Shem* (b). As to *Terah*, I do not find, that he was a Monarch; I can discover no Evidence for it: But, supposing he was a King, yet *Abraham* did not succeed him by an hereditary Right, by Proximity of Blood, or the Right of Primogeniture: Nay, neither *Terah*, nor *Abram*, could have any Pretences to the hereditary Monarchy while *Shem* lived, for they were lineally descended from him; and it is certain that *Shem* lived in the Days of *Abraham*; besides *Abraham* not being the eldest Son of *Terah*: For we read (i) that *Terah* lived Seventy Years, and begat *Abram*, *Nabor* and *Haran*; i. e. he began to be-

(b) Luke iii. 34—36. (i) Gen. xi. 26.

beget them after he came to that Age of Life: But tho' *Abram* is mentioned first, because of the Covenant afterward made with him; yet he was not *Terah's* eldest Son; for we are told (k), that *Terah* lived Two hundred and five Years, and died in *Haran*; he being dead, *Abram* removed from *Haran* (l). At that Time *Abram* was 75 Years old, as we are assured by *Moses* (m); now subtract 75 Years from 205 Years, the Age of *Terah* was 130 Years before the Birth of *Abram*; compare the Passages: If *Terah* began to beget Sons, when he was 75 Years, and *Abram* was not begotten till *Terah* was 130 Years old; this makes it plain, that *Abram* was not his eldest Son. Again, if *Abram* was a Monarch, he seems not to have been of the Mind, that hereditary Succession was *De Jure-divino*; for tho' *Lot* was his Nephew, his Brother's Son; yet he was resolved to pass him, and to make *Eliczer* his Steward, the Heir of all he had: For he said to God (n), Lord what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the Steward of my House is this *Eliczer* of Damascus? And *Abraham* said, Behold, to me thou hast given no Seed: And lo, one born in my House is mine Heir. Whence it

F 2

(k) Gen. xi. 32. (l) Acts vii. 4. (m) Gen. xii. 4.
(n) Gen. 25. 2, 3.

is plain, that if he had not a Son of his own Body, he was to convey his Estate, or (as you would call it) his Kingdom, not to a Blood Relation, but to a Servant, who surely had no hereditary Right, or Right of Blood.

Afterwards we read of Kings in *Edom* before there were Kings of *Israel* (o); but that Monarchy was not hereditary, nor was it indefeasible: There are no less than ten Kings mentioned of that Country who succeeded one after another, but not by an hereditary Right from Father to Son; for when *Bela* the Son of *Beor* died, *Jobab* the Son of *Zerah* reigned in his stead; and when *Jobab* died, *Husham* of the Land of *Temani* reigned in his stead: And so on as to the succeeding Kings. These Kings must have been Kings either by Election or Usurpation; and at last the Monarchy itself came to a Period. Probably these Kings became Tyrants, and abused their Power; this made the People throw off the Yoke, and the Kingdom came to be divided into eleven Dukedoms; for (p) there are no less than eleven Persons called Dukes of *Edom*: They exercised a Power of deposing their Kings. And as they changed their Governors, so the Form of Government

(o) Gen. xxxvi. 31—39. (p) Ver. 40—End.

Government was altered : At first, there were Dukes in *Edom* (q) ; after them they had Kings (r) ; and after Kings, there was a Revolution ; they returned to the Government of Dukes.

As to *Israel*, the Monarchy was not given to *Reuben*, *Jacob's* First-born ; but *Judah*, his Fourth Son : For when he was blessing his Children before his Death, he foretold concerning that Tribe (s), *That the Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a Law-giver from between his Feet, till Shiloh come.* But then the kingly Dominion was not put into the Hands of any of that Tribe, till *David* the youngest Son of *Jesse* was made their King ; and before him, *Saul* of the Tribe of *Benjamin*, the youngest Son of *Kish*, was King of *Israel*. Surely *Saul* had no hereditary Right ; this he owned, when he said (t), *Am not I a Benjamite, the smallest of the Tribes of Israel, and my Family the smallest of all the Families of the Tribe of Benjamin?* And when God nominated him to be their King, he did not entail the Kingdom to his Sons : *Jonathan*, his eldest Son, was slain in Battle ; and tho' *Jonathan* had a Son, called *Mephibosheth*, yet *Abner*, Captain General of the Army,

(q) Gen. xxxvi. 11—31. (r) Ver. 31—40. (s) Chap. xlix. (t) 1 Sam. x. 31.

Army, passed him, because he was but a Child, and lame in his Feet; and pitched on *Ishbosheth*, his Uncle, preferring Capacity to Right, and made him King (*u*). He reigned but two Years, being murdered by the Sons of *Rimmon* (*x*): So that his Kingdom was not only defeasible, but actually an End was put to the Monarchy of *Saul*, not having any Successor of his own Body, or by his Sons.

You'll now be so good to direct an honest Enquirer, where to find any certain Ground upon which he can rely, that the hereditary Monarchical Form of Government obtained in the World some Thousands of Years, since this does not appear from the sacred Records, the most antient of any in the World. Once you thought that the Monarchical hereditary Form of Government obtained in *Scotland* for some Thousands of Years, when you published your most correct (as you call it) Chronological Table of the Kings of *Scotland*; but you, unhappily forgetting yourself, cut off no less than Forty of our Kings, from *Fergus I.* to *Fergus II.* as Nonentities and *Utopian* Kings; that is, 330 Years before the Birth of our Saviour, and 404 after it; in all 734.

But

(*u*) : Sam. ii. 8, 9. (*x*) Chap. iv. 5, 6.

But I shall proceed to the Examination of your other Topicks, advanced for the Confutation of my Argument. Your 4th is, "That by my Argument, Lands and Inheritances should not descend to the Heirs of the present Possessors, unless God had endowed them with virtuous Dispositions for making a right Use of them; whereas we have but too many Examples to the contrary." This Topick is a Consequence you draw from my Argument; but, as I have shown your great Error as to Scripture Antiquities, so I am to show you, that you are no good Logician. To make your Argument to quadrate and agree with the present Question, you must suppose the Possessors of Lands and Inheritances to have a divine, hereditary indefeasible Right to them. If you do this, as you must, otherwise you speak not *ad rem*; then I contend, that God could never intend and design that their Right should be indefeasible, unless he would give them, and their Heirs in Succession, hereditary Virtues and Dispositions, for preserving and making a good Use of them. But you cannot be ignorant, that Grace runs not in a Blood, and that Virtue descends not by Generation from Father to Son. Again, are the private Inheritances of

of Subjects to be put in the Balance with Kingdoms, consisting of Myriads, nay, Millions of Men, moral, free Agents, who should never be treated as Slaves, as they always are where hereditary Monarchy is not limited, but absolute. If you think that the Cases are parallel, you have forgotten your non-such Picture of Lady *Justitia*, and the Device, *unica veritas preponderat cunctis*. In fine, are virtuous Dispositions as necessary for the right Use of the Lands and Inheritances of private Persons, as they are for the good Government of Kingdoms? Do we not see, every Day, Lands and Estates changing their Lords and Proprietors, as well as their Tenants, and sometimes oftner? for the Truth of this, I refer you to the Advertisements you publish thrice every Week, in your infallible Mercury.

Your Fifth Topick, is another Consequence you draw from my Argument, *ab absurdo*, namely, " That my Argument
 " proves too much; for according to it,
 " there should be no Succession at all, ei-
 " ther hereditary or elective in Kingdoms
 " or Common-wealths; for God has no-
 " where promised, that he would, nor
 " could he (without rendering the Persons
 " advanced to these Dignities or Offices

" im-

"impeccable) endue them with all the
 "Qualifications necessary for their right
 "Administation."

Now, Sir, you deliver and broach very
 strange and new Doctrine; namely, That
 Almighty God, who has all infinite Per-
 fections, natural, intellectual and moral,
 could not endow Persons, that succeed to a
 Kingdom, whether hereditary or elective,
 with all the necessary Qualifications for
 their right Administation, without render-
 ing them impeccable. This, I think, bor-
 ders upon blasphemy: For when God rais-
 ed up King *David*, and after him King *So-*
lomon, to the supreme Administation, he
 endowed both sufficiently with all necessary
 Qualifications for their Right Administra-
 tion, and yet they were not rendered impec-
 cable, each offended greatly, and were guil-
 ty of Male-administation. You may as
 well maintain, that God could not endow
 the great Company of Angels, that lost
 their Innocence and Purity, *and kept not*
their first Estate (z) (Marg. Principalities)
 with all Abilities for their standing, with-
 out rendering them impeccable.

Again, the good Angels were endowed
 with all necessary Qualifications for conti-
 nuing in their happy State, and did perfe-

(A) Jude v. 6. (B) (C) (D) (E) (F) (G) (H) (I) (J) (K) (L) (M) (N) (O) (P) (Q) (R) (S) (T) (U) (V) (W) (X) (Y) (Z)

vere in their first Estate ; and yet were not thereby rendered impeccable. In like Manner our original Parents, *Adam* and *Eve*, the federal Representatives of all Mankind, were endowed with all Qualifications necessary for standing and continuing in their holy, honourable and happy Estate, being created in the Divine Image, and after his Likeness, i. e. very like unto God (a), yet were not rendered impeccable : God made Man upright, but they found out many Inventions (b). God likewise honoured him greatly : He crowned him with Glory and Honour. Thou madest him to have Dominion over the Works of thy Hand ; thou hast put all Things under his Feet : All Sheep and Oxen, yea, and Beasts of the Field : The Fowl of the Air, and the Fish of the Sea (c) : And yet, Man that was in Honour continued not, but became as the Beasts that perish (d). The bad Effects and Consequences of this Apostasy remain to this Day. The Creature was made Subject to Vanity ;—under the Bondage of Corruption ;—the whole Creation groaneth, and travaileth in Pain together till now (e). In fine, you strongly confirm my Objection, instead of answering it, when you say, that God nowhere

(a) Gen. i. 26. (b) Eccl. vii. 29. (c) Psal. viii. 5, 6, 7. (d) Psal. xlix. 12. (e) Rom. viii. 20,---24.

where promised that he would endow all Persons advanced to these Dignities and Offices, with all Qualifications necessary for their right Administration ; for, from this Concession, I make a just Inference, that God never intended, that the Royal Dignity and Office, should be indefeasibly hereditary.

It seems, that you was convinced, that you was not able to silence me by your five foresaid Considerations or Topicks ; and therefore, that you may stop my Mouth, you advance a sixth, wherewith you hope to succeed.

Topick Sixth, you say, “ That to silence
 “ me on this Head, you can assign me two
 “ Instances, where God did appoint the
 “ highest Offices and Power to descend by
 “ hereditary Succession, without endowing
 “ the Persons, to whom they should de-
 “ volve, with the excellent Qualifications
 “ I speak of.”

Here, good Sir, you'll allow me to put you in mind again, that the Right that you spoke of and asserted, and which I impugn, is a strict and absolute hereditary Right to a Kingdom, founded on Proximity of Blood, and under no Limitations, and consequently indefeasible. Having premised this, that I may keep you to the

Point, for you often extravagane from it; I shall shew that the Instances you adduce, do by no Means serve your Cause.

Your first Instance is, "That of the
 " Priesthood among the *Israelites*, which
 " was entailed on the Posterity of *Aaron*;
 " and yet the sacred History informs us,
 " that many of these Priests were wicked
 " and foolish Men." Here I observe a
 little Art you use in proposing this Instance.
 You say, the Priesthood was entailed on the
Posterity of Aaron. The Word *Posterity*
 is of large Extent and Comprehension:
 Now, if the Priesthood went to any one of
Aaron's Posterity, tho' he was not the near-
 est in Blood to the last Possessor, such an
 Entail would hold good, tho' he was in
 some remote Degrees from him. But this
 is not your Doctrine concerning the here-
 ditary Right to the Crown of *Scotland*.
 Will you call this hereditary Succession?
 when the Parliaments of *Scotland* and *Eng-
 land* entailed their respective Crowns and
 Kingdoms to Princess *Sophia* Electress of
Hanover, and to the Descendents from her:
 The Right by this Means was conveyed to
 the Posterity of King *James VI.* but surely
 this is not the hereditary Succession you
 contend for; because this Entail did cut
 off

off the Succession to King *James VI.* by Proximity of Blood.

Again, the *Aaronical* Priesthood was not strictly and absolutely hereditary, for it was subjected to Limitations and Provisos; so that when any of his Successors did not execute the Office, according to the Limitations fixed by the Law of the Priesthood, they could be deposed from the Office. the general Limitation was, *Quamdiu se bene gesserint.* *Nadab* and *Abihu* were the eldest Sons of *Aaron*; but they having offered strange Fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not, God did cut them off, that they might not inherit; then went out Fire before the Lord, and devoured them (f). He had other two Sons, *Eleazar* and *Ithamar*. *Eleazar* was the eldest; but did the Priesthood always continue in his Line? surely not; for tho' *Phinehas*, the Son of *Eleazar*, had a Promise from God, That he would give to him the Covenant of Peace, even the Covenant of an everlasting Priesthood; because he was zealous for his God, and made an Atonement for the Children of Israel. And tho' he made Atonement, by executing Judgment on the Idolaters (g); yet the Promise was still conditional, i. e. as long as he should behave himself well, and his

Ad-

(f) Lev. x. 1, 2. (g) Numb. xxv. 12, 13.

Administration should be according to the Divine Law: For because of his Miscarriage, or that of his Sons, the Promise was made void; but what their Male-administration was, we are not particularly told; wherefore it would be in vain to inquire, and impossible for us certainly to determine. I say, that the Promise was made void; for the Priesthood was transferred from his direct Line, to *Eli* the Son of *Ithamar* (b); *The Lord God of Israel said indeed, that thy House, and the House of thy Father should walk before me for ever, i. e. should perpetually officiate in the sacerdotal Office; but this Promise was likewise conditional; that is, so long as they should discharge the Duty of it, and not be guilty of Male-administration: But so it came to pass, that his Sons, Hophni and Phinehas, profaned the sacred Office, to such a high Degree, by their gross and abominable Impieties, as that the People were made to abhor the Offering of the Lord, And their Father Eli did not use his Authority, so seasonably and carefully, as he ought to have done, for restraining and discouraging them: And since they were not restrained, he should have excluded them from all Ministration in holy Things: And because he did it not,*

The

(b) 1 Sam. ii. 30.

The Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed, that thy House, and the House of thy Father should walk before me for ever (i. e. Officiate in the Office for ever.) But now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honour me, I will honour, and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed. And it is added, Hophni and Phinehas shall die in one Day both of them. And I will raise me up a faithful Priest, that shall do that which is in mine Heart, and in my Mind: And I will build him a sure House, and he shall walk before mine Anointed for ever. And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left in thine House, shall come and crouch to him for a Piece of Silver, and a Morsel of Bread, and shall say, Put me (I pray thee) into one of the Priests Offices, that I may eat a Piece of Bread (i). But the full Execution of this Sentence was not immediately gone about: For tho' Eli and his two Sons, were in one Day by Death deprived, yet the Posterity of Phinehas (for Hophni had no Sons) continued in the Office, till the Days of King Solomon, as appears by the following Table.

Eli,

(i) 1 Sam. ii. 30, 34, 35, 36.

*Eli.**Phinehas.*The Sons of *Phinehas*,*Achijah.**Achimelech.*

1 Sam. xiv. 3.

1 Sam. xxiii. 9.

*Abiathar,*the Son of *Achimelech.*

This *Abiathar*, that the Threatning against *Eli* and his House might be accomplished, was thrust out of the Office by King *Solomon*, because he sided with *Adonijah* in the Conspiracy; tho' *Adonijah*, as to Priority of Birth, had the Right preferably to *Salomon* (k). And unto *Abiathar* the Priest, said the King, Get thee to *Anathoth*, for thou art worthy of Death: But I will not at this Time put thee to Death, because thou barest the Ark of the Lord God before *David* my Father, and because thou hast been afflicted in all wherein my Father was afflicted. So *Solomon* thrust out *Abiathar* from being Priest unto the Lord, that he might fulfil the Word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the House of *Eli* in *Shiloh*. *Zadok* the Priest did the King put in the Room of

(k) 1 Kings ii. 26, 27, 35.

of Abiathar: For Zadok was not in Adonijah's Plot (1).

You see, Sir, that the Priests of the Lord were justly deprived, because of their Wickedness; so that their Right was not only defeasible, but actually defeated and cut off: But you maintain, that a hereditary King cannot be deposed for any Male-administration whatsoever. Does your Instance of Priests, whose Right was not only defeasible, but actually defeated, shew, that the hereditary Right of a King is indefeasible or indefectible? From the above Narration, there can be nothing more certain, than that there was a long Interruption of the Right itself, or of the hereditary Succession of the Priesthood; nay, that the direct Line was cut off for a considerable Time. Will you now say, That the Exercise of the Right was only interrupted (as you do in the Dispute, as to some of our Kings) but not the Right itself? Will you say, as in the Dispute, That, upon the Death of one King, the next Person in Proximity of Blood, does that very Moment succeed; according to your Maxim, or rather Quibble, *Quia Rex non moritur*, because of some Instances you give, that the Successors have, within a

H

Short

(1), 1 Kings i. 8.

short Time, been declared Kings; when yet there are innumerable Instances can be given, when others did not immediately succeed, or in that very Moment (as you express it) succeed? And can you apply it to the Case in Hand, and say, That the Posterity of *Eleazar*, the eldest Son of *Aaron*, held the Right all the Time, that they were deprived of it? Will you coin another Maxim, and say, *Quia Sacerdos non moritur?* I hope I have now put you to Silence, as to your first Instance.

Your Second Instance is, "The Royal Government of the Kingdom of *Judah*, confirmed, as the Scripture expresseth it, 2 *Chron.* xiii. 5, by a Covenant of Salt; and yet the same sacred History informs us, That many of these Kings were very foolish and wicked Men." But, Sir, the Words you cite, are the Words, not of an inspired Person, but of one of the very foolish and wicked Kings of *Judah*: The Scripture only says this narrative, by relating what *Abijah* said. Again it is false, that either the Scripture or *Abijah* saith, that the Kingdom of *Judah* was confirmed by a Covenant of Salt: For the Words, in the Place you cite, are; Ought you not to know, that the Lord God of Israel gave the Kingdom over Israel to David for ever, even

to him and his Sons by a Covenant of Salt? These are the Words of *Abijah* competing, for the Kingdom of the ten Tribes, with *Jeroboam* the Son of *Nebat*, who had been a Servant of King *Solomon*. This is your Blunder thro' Inattention, or rather a designed Perversion of the Text: You saw, that *David* and his Sons had not the Kingdom of *Israel* for ever, but that they had the Kingdom of *Judah* for a very long Time; and therefore, you make *Abijah* say, That it was confirmed by a Covenant of Salt, to impose upon your Readers. Again, in this Competition, *Jeroboam* could have reply'd, (and no Doubt but he knew his Right) That God had given the ten Tribes to him, and had entailed it to him and his Posterity. I own it was conditionally; and so was any Entail that we read of, to *David*, as will more fully appear in the Sequel. Neither the one nor the other had an absolute hereditary indefeasible Right to any Kingdom whatsoever: *Abijah* seems to have had a Respect in the foresaid Citation, to the Words of God to King *David*, 2 Sam. vii. 16, *Thine House and thy Kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy Throne shall be established for ever*: But these Words were not said to King *David* when he was King of

Judah; for he was King of *Judah* several Years before he was King over all *Israel*; they were spoken to *David*, not for a Number of Years after he was made King over the ten Tribes. And the literal Meaning is, That the Kingdom shall go to him and his Descendents conditionally, as you shall see in the Sequel: But there is a spiritual and mystical Sense to be adverted to in these Words; as appears by the Notification made by the Angel to *Mary*, the Blessed Virgin, Mother of our LORD (m). He assured her, *That the Son to be born of her, shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the Throne of his Father David: And he shall reign over the House of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no End.* Again I cannot read anywhere, That God did confirm the Kingdom, either of *Judah* or *Israel*, by a Covenant of Salt, to *David*. It is true that *Abijah* says, That God confirmed, to the Heirs or Descendents of *David*, the Kingdom over *Israel*, but not, as you say, over *Judah*: And when *Abijah* says, That the Kingdom over *Israel* was confirmed to *David* by a Covenant of Salt; he borrows the Phrase from *Numb. xviii. 19*, or alludes to what is said there, where

(m) Luke i. 32, 33.

Mention is made of a Statute for the Maintenance of the Priests; *All the Heave-offerings of the holy Things, which the Children of Israel shall offer unto the Lord, have I given thee, and thy Sons, and thy Daughters, by a Statute for ever: it is a Covenant of Salt for ever, before the Lord, unto thee, and to thy Seed with thee.* But, Sir, as the Provision for the Priests was not promised to be absolutely perpetual, but only to endure for a long Time, as long as that Priesthood was to continue; for an End was put to it, and all legal Sacrifices and Oblations, by *Christ's* one Oblation of himself to take away Sin: So from this, an indefeasible hereditary Right to a Kingdom, can never be inferred. Further, when the Oblation, or Heave-offering, was given to the Priests by a Covenant of Salt, this cannot hold out an absolute Perpetuity; for Salt can only preserve Things from Corruption and Putrefaction, for a short Time. Besides, this Covenant was conditional; it was upon these Conditions, viz. the Intemperance of their Lives, and their faithful Care about the Worship of God: And so there is still no Evidence, from your second Instance, that any Kingdom mentioned in Scripture, is indefeasibly hereditary.

King

King *David* himself, who had the Kingdom of *Israel* entailed to him, and his Posterity for ever, but conditionally, explains this Perpetuity, or for ever, of a long Duration, 2 *Sam.* vii. 19. 1 *Chron.* xvii. 17. *Thou hast spoken of thy Servant's House for a great while to come.* In this Sense Circumcision is called an everlasting Covenant, *i. e.* a Sacrament of it, till the Ceremonial Law should be abrogated. And now, since *David* had that Kingdom entailed to him, and his Posterity, for a great while; this plainly says, that the Right itself by that Entail was not indefeasible; and will any Man contend, that the Right of any other King was or is indefeasible?

You, Sir, conclude your six Topicks by a most surprizing Paragraph (o), saying, "That as to the Indefeasibleness of the hereditary Succession our Author speaks of [you might have said, which you have been establishing by your Topicks] it is not to be denied, that the Rule of Succession [*i. e.* as I take you, by Proximity of Blood] has sometimes by himself [meaning God] to make his Sovereign Dominion above all Kings known, and for other wise Ends of his Providence, been broken and interrupted." But, Sir,

do you distinguish betwixt the Right to succeed, or the hereditary Right, and the Rule of Succession? If you do not, then the Right is not indefeasible; if you distinguish them, you had done well to have told us, wherein that Distinction does consist. You'll here remember, that you assert, the Rule of Succession is sometimes broken and interrupted by God himself. You add, that sometimes God, for the Punishment of wicked Kings, has permitted it to be not only interrupted, but entirely cut off; that is, as I conceive, for ever cut off. Here you distinguish as to the Rule: You say, God himself breaks it sometimes, but when it is entirely cut off, you say, he permits it to be done, *i. e.* he suffers Men to do it. But, was it a naked and mere Permission, when the Posterity of *Solomon* were entirely and for ever cut off from the Succession to the Royal Government of the ten Tribes? Surely not; for *Ahijah* the Prophet declared to *Jeroboam*, that God himself would do it, *1 Kings xi. 31.* *Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, behold I will rend the Kingdom out of the Hand of Solomon, and give it to thee.* - And *Chap. xii. 15.* *For the Cause was from the Lord, that he might perform his saying, which the Lord spake by Ahijah the Shilonite unto* Jero-

Jeroboam the Son of Nebat. Was also this but a bare Permission? And you'll observe, that this was done, not for the Sins of the People of *Israel*, but the Ten Tribes were to be rended out of the Hands of *Solomon*, because of his own Sins.

Here you subjoin, " But how far it is agreeable to his holy Will, (you say) your Argument does not require you to enter upon the Merits of that Cause." It is Presumption in the highest Degree, in you to make a Doubt of it, or to bring it in question, if it is agreeable to his holy Will to permit the Rule of Succession to be entirely cut off, when God has done it himself; indeed, when Men do a Thing that is sinful, it is contrary to his holy Will; but it is Blasphemy to say, that his Permission of it is contrary to his holy Will; especially since you say, " He permits this for the Punishment of wicked Kings and People." You likewise add, " But how far God's permitting the Rule of Succession to be entirely cut off, is agreeable to the Nature and Constitution of hereditary Kingdoms, it is not your Business to enter into the Merits of that Cause on either Side." But, Sir, you had taken to a Side, by contending for the strict absolute hereditary Right of our Kings

Kings of the Race of *Stewart* to be *De jure divino*: For when I had objected, Treat. 1st on Gov. p. 45, to that monstrous Act of Parliament 1681, bearing, *That the Kings of this Realm derive their Royal Power from God Almighty ALONE; and declaring it to be High Treason to write or speak against it; and that such Attempts shall infer the Pains of Treason.* I say, when I had objected to that Clause, *That our Kings of Scotland derive their Power from God Almighty ALONE;* that this Phrase was not known in *Scotland* till the Restoration: And that the Duke of *York* being the King's Commissioner to this Parliament, it was contrived, that there might be no Bill brought into Parliament for excluding him from the Succession, as there had been in *England*. The Answer you make to this is a perfect Joke; and if you are serious, it is like the many weak Defences you rely upon. You say (p), "That it was used by some of the Sovereigns of *Scotland* long before the Reformation." But any Person that will honestly consider the Drift of the two Pages, where I made the Objection, will be perswaded, that I intended, that the Phrase had never been used by any Parliament of *Scotland* before the Restoration.

tion. You condescend upon two Instances, for shewing the Use of the Phrase by our Kings.

The first you bring, from the Chartulary of *Dunfermline*; the Writer of which records it, in these Words, concerning our King *Alexander III.* Memorandum, quod Anno gratie 1278, die Apostolorum Simonis & Jude, apud Westmonasterium, Alexander Rex Scotiæ fecit homagium Domino Edwardo Regi Angliæ, filio Regis Henrici, sub his verbis: Ego devenio hominem vestrum de terris, quas de vobis teneo in regno Angliæ, de quibus homagium vobis debeo, salvo regno meo. Tunc dixit Episcopus Norwicensis, & salvum sit Regi Angliæ, si jus habeat ad homagium vestrum de Regno; cui Rex statim, & aperte dicens, ad homagium Regni mei Scotiæ nullus jus habet, nisi solus Deus, nec illud teneo, nisi de solo Deo. The Kings of England had for sometime contended to be Sovereign Lords of Scotland; and that, as *Alexander III.* pay'd Homage to the King of England for the Lands he had in England, so the Bilhop of *Norwich* protested for the Claim of the King of England, if he had a Right, that Homage should be likewise paid him for Scotland. To which the King of Scotland instantly replied, avowedly protesting, That none had a Right to Homage for my King.

Kingdom of *Scotland* but God alone, neither do I hold it but of God alone. Now, when *Alexander III.* protested, that none, *i. e.* no Man, had a Right to have Homage paid by him for the Kingdom of *Scotland* but God alone; he means, that neither the King of *England*, nor the Pope of *Rome*, had a Right to it: These were the only Men who had any Claim to it; I never heard of any other: In Opposition to these, he justly said, he held it only of God. I never read, even of an elective King, that paid Homage to his Subjects, or to these who elected him for it: But yet, if an elective King should govern tyrannically, and overturn the Constitution, and invade the fundamental Rights and Liberties of these who elected them, the States who elected him can roundly tell him, that he has forfeited his Right, and choose to them another King in his stead. Nay, without entring at present into the Dispute, whether the States made *Robert Bruce* to be their King, or whether he was the righteous Heir to the Crown? they roundly declared their Resolution in a Letter to the Pope, when they threatened to expel him, if he should attempt to subject them to the *English*, and choose another in his stead; and this you own may be

said to him in such a Case. - And now, Sir, it is incumbent upon you to shew, if this is consistent with God's holy Will, and agreeable to the Nature and Constitution of hereditary Monarchy. In fine, Do you not know that the Kingdom of *Poland* is elective? and yet it is one of his Titles, *Rex Dei Gratia*.

Your *second* Instance for the Use of the Phrase, That our Kings derive their Power from God Almighty ALONE, is, of our Queen *Mary*, in Mr. *Anderson's* Collections (q); where, in the Conference at *York*, it is said in these Words, "The Queen of *Scots* Commissioners protested solemnly, that they intend nowise, that the Queen's Majesty, their Sovereign, should recognize herself to be subject to any Judge in Earth, in respect she is a free Princess, having imperial Crown given her of God, and acknowledgeth no other Superior." This Instance is most ridiculous: You must be sore put to it, when you adduce it. For, did she not resign in favour of her Son; nay, did not the States accept of her Resignation, and accordingly crowned her Son, who possess'd it all the Days of her Life: Could she be our legal Queen, when her Son was King

a long Time after this Resignation ? there was no *locus penitentiae*. Again, the Act of Parliament 1373, which you and many others look upon to be genuine, that was lately discovered, excludes all Females from succeeding to the Crown of Scotland, by the strongest exclusive Clauses that the Latine Tongue does furnish: When the Entail is to *heredibus duntaxat masculis, heredibus tantum masculis, and heredibus tantummodo masculis*; and the *ratio legis* in the said Act is, *ob mala & damna ex successione femellarum*: These they say always obtain. So that Queen Mary being excluded by this Act, she only could have a Parliamentary Right.

But because you seem to labour this, that the Kingdom of Judah was strictly indefeasibly hereditary, from P. 136—140, I shall take under my Review, what you advance in these Pages.

PART II. Sir, that you may establish your Doctrine of the hereditary Succession of the Kings of Judah by Proximity of Blood, and, as is infinitely probable, (these are your Words, Pag. 139) by the Right of Primogeniture, you advance several Positions, which have no Probability in them at all,

The

The first is in Pag. 136, namely, that *David* was anointed by *Samuel*, and thereby authorised by God himself immediately to be King over all *Israel*. Here one Part of your Assertion overthrows another. You say that *David* was authorised by God himself immediately to be King over all *Israel*; and yet you say he was authorised by *Samuel's* anointing him: *Samuel* was God's Instrument: There was the Intervention of the *Unction* by *Samuel*, and by this you say he was authorised by God; but surely not immediately. We are told (r), That God at sundry Times, and in diverse Manners, spoke in Time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets. If he spoke to them by the Prophets, then he did not speak to them himself immediately. Their Fathers entreated *Moses* (s) saying, *Speak thou with us; but let not God speak with us (i.e. immediately) lest we die.* In like Manner, if *David* was authorised to be King, by *Samuel's* anointing of him, he was not authorised immediately by God himself. I know no Text of Scripture you can have an Eye to, but that in 1 Sam. xvi. 1. *Fill thine Horn with Oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite, for I have provided me a King among his Sons, i. e.*

(r) Heb. i. 1. (s) Exod. xx. 19, with Heb. xii.

I am determin'd he shall be King; or I have chosen him to be King, for so it is expressed, *ver. 8, 9, 10.* Now this Divine Election of him to be King, was *ab eterno*; and God revealed his Purpose to *Samuel* in Time: When *Jesse* brought *David* to him, the Lord said, *ver. 12. Arise, anoint him; for this is he.* *Ver. 13.* Then *Samuel* took the Horn of Oil, and anointed him in the Midst of his Brethren. He was not by this anointing, actually invested with the Authority and Dignity of a King; but all the Use of it was, that since he had no Right, nor Pretension to be a King, to ascertain him of the Divine Intention, and to notify to his Father and his elder Brother, for he was the youngest, that he should, in the Time prefixt in the Divine Purpose, be invested with the Regal Authority; for as yet *Saul* was the Lord's Anointed; and several Years after this, till the Day of his Death. *David* after this was pitched upon to be the King's Musician and his Armour Bearer, *ver. 18. 21.* He did fight several Battles most successfully, and was honour'd with a Marriage, whereby he became the King's Son-in-law. And *Saul* is by *David*, ever after this, acknowledged to be the Lord's Anointed, *1 Sam. xxiv. 6, 10.* For this Reason he would not stretch forth his

his own Hand against *Saul*; and for the same Reason he would not suffer *Abishai* to do it, 1 *Sam.* 26, 9. and blamed *Saul's* Servants for not having a vigilant Care of him, *ver.* 16. And for the same Reason he gave Order to smite the *Amalakite* so as to die, because he was not afraid to slay the Lord's Anointed, 2 *Sam.* i. 14, 16. And now, since by this anointing, *David* was not authorised, *i. e.* invested with actual Authority, either over *Judah* or *Israel*: And since this anointing was only private before his Brethren, it was very consistent for the Men of *Judah* to come after *Saul's* Death and anoint him King over the House of *Judah* (1). But then he was anointed privately by *Samuel*, and more publickly after *Saul's* Death by the Men of *Judah*; but he was not authorised as yet, either by God or Man, to be King over the Ten Tribes, for *Ishbosheth*, *Saul's* Son, reigned over these Tribes two Years after *David* was anointed King by the Men of *Judah*: Nay, he was not authorised to be King over the Ten Tribes, till *Ishbosheth* the Son of *Saul*, who had been their King two Years, was barbarously murdered by the Sons of *Rimmon* the *Beerothite*. By this Villany,

(1) 2 *Sam.* v. 1—3.

they thought to ingratiate themselves with *David*; for they came in all Haste to him at *Hebron*, with *Ishbosheth's* Head in their Hands, and calling *Ishbosheth* his Enemy, expecting a Reward: But *David* calls *Ishbosheth* a righteous Man, and required their Blood off their Hands, and commanded his Men to slay them. This remarkable Justice executed upon them, for such a notorious Murder committed upon their King, recommended *David* very much to them; and therefore, tho' *Mephibosheth* the Son of *Jonathan*, and Grandson of *Saul* was alive, yet he being lame in his Feet, they passed him. This Vengeance executed on the Murderers of their King, seems to have given rise to their offering to him the Government: They likewise remembered his great Services in their Wars. *Thou leddest out and broughtest in Israel* (u). They also make mention, that God designed him to be their Ruler and Captain-General: *The Lord said to thee, thou shalt feed my People Israel, and thou shalt be Captain over Israel*. But we do not read that God himself immediately said this to *David*; but God said the equivalent by his Servant *Samuel*: The People themselves seem to have their Eye to the Words of *Samuel* to *Saul* (x); But

K

now

(u) 2 Sam. v. 2. (x) 1 Sam. xiii. 14.

now thy Kingdom shall not continue: The Lord hath sought him a Man after his own Heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be Captain over his People, because thou hast not kept that which the Lord commanded thee. The Present is used for the Future, i. e. the Lord will command him to be Captain over his People: For Samuel at this Time did not know which of the Sons of Jesse was designed by God to be King: He did not know that David the youngest had the Divine Designation; nay, did not know this till he was sent to anoint David (2). And it would seem that the Ten Tribes knew nothing of this, when after Saul's Death, they made his Son Ishbosheth their King: Nay, it is probable, they knew not this Designation of David to be their King till the Death of Ishbosheth; or if they knew it, they did not regard it: And David himself by it, was not invested with any Authority over them.

I notice a second Position you lay down (a) viz. "That God had entailed the Kingdom of Judah upon the Posterity of David, till that Monarchy came to an End in the Days of Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon." This Position is false; for the Kingdom of Judah was twice a separate King-

(2) 1 Sam. xvi. 1—14. (a) Ans. P. 138.

Kingdom from that of the Ten Tribes; 1st, After the Death of *Saul*, *David* was King of *Judah* Seven Years and a Half, till the Death of *Ishbosheth*, the Grandson of *Saul*; for he reigned over the Ten Tribes two Years, during the Reign of *David* over *Judah*; and it seems there was an *Interregnum* of Five and a Half Years: We read of no such Entail of the Kingdom of *Judah*. Again, 2^{dly}, the Kingdom of *Judah* became a distinct and separate Kingdom from that of the Ten Tribes, upon their Revolt from *Rehoboam*. *Rehoboam* then was only King of *Judah*, and *Jeroboam*, the Son of *Nebat*, was King of the Ten Tribes. Now, I do not find in my Bible that the Kingdom of *Judah*, in the Time, and from the Time that *Rehoboam* reigned over them, till that Monarchy came to an End in the Days of *Nebuchadnezzar* King of *Babylon*, was entailed to the Posterity of *David*. You cite a great many Texts of Scripture, the Books, Chapters and Verses, without inserting the Words (b); whether this was done intentionally, I know not: But had you inserted the Words of these Texts, your Readers would have been convinced, that most of them speak of the Entail of the Kingdom of *Israel* to the Posterity of *David*; such as 2 *Sam.* vii. 12, 19. compare this

K 2

with

(b) *Anf. P.* 138.

with *ver.* 29, 26. & *1 Kings* ii. 4. and viii. 25. & xi. 38. & *1 Chron.* xvii. 17. which you'll compare with *ver.* 21. & *2 Chron.* vi. 16. & xiii. 4. These are Seven of your Texts, and they all speak of the Entail of the Kingdom of *Israel* to *David* and his Posterity; or as it is expressed in these Texts, *That there shall not fail David a Man to sit on the Throne of Israel.* And to help you a little, I shall mention some more, such as, *1 Kings* ix. 5. & x. 9. & *2 Chron.* vi. 10. & *Jer.* xxxi. 17. It is true, that in the Reigns of *David* and *Solomon*, the Kingdom of *Israel* consisted both of *Judah* and the Ten Tribes; but that which you was to prove, That the Kingdom of *Judah* by itself was entailed to *David* and his Posterity. Again, when God was to rend the Kingdom from *Solomon*, and destroy the Entail, because of his Male-administration, he said, *1 Kings* xi. 13. That he would give one Tribe to his Son, namely, *Rehoboam*: And it is added, *ver.* 36. that *David* my Servant may have a Light alway before me in *Jerusalem*. The same is said as to *Abijam*, *1 Kings* xv. 4. and with respect to *Jehoram*, *2 Kings* viii. 19. & *2 Chron.* xxi. 7. These are your other Scriptures for proving the Entail of the Kingdom of *Judah* to *David* and his Posterity. But

Sir,

Sir, *David* was dead long before *Rehoboam*; the first of these Kings did succeed: And I do not perceive how an Entail of a Kingdom could be said to be made to a dead Man. As to these Kings, viz. *Rehoboam*, *Abijam* and *Jehoram*, and several others of the Kings of *Judah*, namely, *Ahaziah*, *Uzziah*, *Josiah*, you say, Pag. 139, " That the sacred Volumes assures us, That they had their Right established in a direct hereditary Succession, by no less Authority than that of God himself: In which, likewise, it is remarkable, that all these Kings, being, in Number from *Solomon* to *Josiah*, Fifteen, succeeded one another, from Father to Son by Proximity of Blood; and, as is infinitely probable, by the Right of Primogeniture, without so much as one of the collateral Line among them all, for the Space of 405 Years, reckoning from the Beginning of *Solomon's*, to the End of *Josiah's* Reign." In this Paragraph, we have some more of your Positions, which every Body that has the least Acquaintance with the sacred Writings must reject.

1. You asserted, in p. 138, That God entailed the Kingdom of *Judah* upon the Posterity of *David*, till that Monarchy came to an End in the Days of *Nebuchad-*

nezzar

nezzar King of *Babylon*. You'll certainly grant, that King *David* had no hereditary Right to the Kingdom of *Judah*, because he was the youngest Son of *Jesse* the *Bethlehemite*. You say, God entailed the Kingdom of *Judah* to the Posterity of *David*: But what sort of an Entail was this; for, in the Succession to *David*, nine elder Sons are past over, and *Solomon*, *David's* Tenth Son, succeeded him. This Entail, you here speak of, is not founded on Proximity of Blood, or the Right of Primogeniture, which is the Question betwixt you and me; do you mean by the Posterity of *David* in this Entail, that the Kingdom of *Judah* was to go from Father to the eldest Son, or by Proximity of Blood; which is the only pertinent Consideration, that can support your Doctrine? I shall anon shew the Falshood of it. You make a twofold Entail of the Kingdom of *Judah*; the first to *David* and his Posterity in general, which is not founded on Proximity; and you say it continued till *Nebuchadnezzar* put an End to that Monarchy. A second Entail of the Kingdom of *Judah* you make to be to *Solomon*, and his Descendents, and from him to the End of the Reign of *Josiah*: This Entail is shorter than your first, and founded on Proximity of Blood.

You

You say, that the Kings of *Judah* from *Solomon*, had their Right established by a direct hereditary Succession, from Father to Son, by Proximity of Blood, and (as is infinitely probable) by the Right of Primogeniture. But, Sir, you know that *Solomon* was not only King of *Judah*, but likewise of the ten Tribes; and you maintain, that his Right was a divine Right: But this divine Right to the greatest Part of his Kingdom was not established, as you think, by a direct hereditary Succession: So that, according to you, we have a *jure divino* King, whose Successors, as to the greatest Part of the Kingdom, was not hereditary. But, Sir, I maintain, that the Succession to *Solomon's* Kingdom, in its full Extent, was established but conditionally to him and his Posterity, *1 Kings ix. 4, 5.* *If thou wilt walk before me, as David thy Father walked, in Integrity of Heart, and in Uprightness, to do according to all that I have commanded thee, and wilt keep my Statutes and my Judgments, then I will establish the Throne of thy Kingdom upon Israel for ever, as I promised to David thy Father, saying, There shall not fail thee a Man upon the Throne of Israel.* We have the Promise made to *David* with the same Limitation, and he acknowledged it, *1 Kings ii. 4.* Here we have an Entail of the

the Kingdom of *Israel*, comprehending *Judah* and the ten Tribes: How come you then to restrict the Entail to that of *Judah*? This Entail being conditional, tho' the Right was hereditary, it was not infeasible. *Rehoboam* the Son of *Solomon* succeeded to the Government only of two Tribes, *Judah* and *Benjamin*; the ten Tribes would not admit him to the Government over them; because he would not ease them of the Burdens and Oppressions of his Father, for keeping up the Port and Grandeur of his 700 Wives and 300 Concubines; he had 1400 Chariots (c), 4000 Stalls for Horses, and 12000 Horsemen (d): All this was contrary to their Claim of Right; and because he threatened them with Tyranny, that he would govern them by mere Will and Pleasure, by absolute Prerogative and uncontrollable Authority. He said to the Elders that gave him salutary Council (e); *Whereas my Father made your Yoke heavy, I will add to your Yoke; my Father chastised you with Whips, but I will chastise you with Scorpions.* Therefore they renounced his Authority; they said, *What Portion have we in David, neither have we Inheritance in the Son of Jesse; to your Tents,*

(c) 1 Kings x. 26. (d) 2 Chron. ix. 26, (e) 1 Kings xii. 14.

O Israel: See to thine own House; O David: They knew that David was not their King by any hereditary Right, and that Solomon himself had no hereditary Right to succeed David: Nay, the ten Tribes not only rejected Rehoboam, but after Solomon there never was one of the House and Family of David their King; so that they were cut off entirely from the Right itself.

Again, we read of no Entail of a Kingdom to the Posterity of David, till the Ten Tribes accepted of him to be their King, and then the Kingdom of Israel, comprehending all the Tribes of Israel, was given to David (g); All the Tribes of Israel came to David unto Hebron, and spake, saying, Behold we are thy Bone, and thy Flesh. Also in Time past, when Saul was King over us, thou wast he that leddest out, and broughtest in Israel: And the Lord said to thee, Thou shalt feed (i. e. govern) my People Israel, and thou shalt be a Captain over Israel (rather, thou shalt be Captain over Israel). So all the Elders of Israel came to the King to Hebron, and King David made a League with them in Hebron before the Lord; and they anointed David King over Israel. In a Chron. xi. 3. it is added according to the Word of the Lord, by Samuel (Marg. by the Hand of Samuel)

1 Chron. xi.

L

i. e.

(g) 2 Sam. v. 1, 2, 3.

i. e. by the Ministry of *Samuel*; not that *Samuel* anointed him at this Time in *Hebron*, for he was dead before it. This Word of the Lord by *Samuel*, we have 1 *Sam.* xvi. 12, 13. *The Lord said (to Samuel) arise, anoint him: For this is he. Then Samuel took the Horn of Oil, and anointed him in the Midst of his Brethren.* But this Anointing did not make him their King. *Grotius* in *Loc.* made this Observation; *Hæc unctio Davidi non regnum dedit, sed regno eum destinavit, jusque ei dedit conservandi quibus posset modis ad tempus usque adipiscendi regni*, i. e. this Anointing did not confer the Kingdom upon *David*, but it was a Destination of him to it; and did warrand him to essay all Means he could for his Safety, till the Time he should obtain the Kingdom: But this Anointing being done privately only, in the Midst of his Brethren, the Elders of *Israel* would have it done at this publick Assembly of the States of the Kingdom. But the Kingdom was not entailed to him and his Son *Solomon* for some Time after this, as appears from 2 *Sam.* vii. 12, — 17. And when *Solomon* did plead this Promise, he calls that which God promised or entailed, the *Throne of Israel*, 1 *Kings* viii. 25. 2 *Chron.* vi. 16.

Another

Another Position laid down by you (b) is, " That the Kings of Judah, being in Number, from Solomon to Josiah, Fifteen, succeeded one another, from Father to Son, by Proximity of Blood; and (as it is infinitely probable) by the Right of Primogeniture." And in the same Page you call their Succession a direct hereditary Succession. But, Sir, you have a strange Way of reading your Bible, and of commenting upon it. Will you say, that Abijam, the Son of Rehoboam, succeeded him by a direct hereditary Right, by Proximity of Blood, and by the Right of Primogeniture? All these Phrases you multiply to make your Assertion the stronger: Nay, you say, " That it is infinitely probable, that these Fifteen had the Right of Primogeniture." But, to use your Word, I assert, That it is not only infinitely improbable, but infinitely false: For Abijam was not the eldest Son of Rehoboam; and consequently could not have the Right of Primogeniture; for King Rehoboam had no less than two Wives before Maachab the Mother of Abijam, namely, Mahalish, the Daughter of Jerimoth, the Son of David, and Abihail the Daughter of Eliab, the Son of Jesse. This Abihail bare to Rehoboam

L 2

three

three Sons, namely, *Jeush*, *Shamariah* and *Zabam*; so that each had the Right of Succession preferably to *Abijam*. But we are told what moved him to pass by these Sons of *Abibail*, namely, his Love to *Maachab* above all his Wives. This determined him to make *Abijam* the chief Ruler among his Brethren; For, it is said, *He thought* (i. e. intended or resolved) *to make him King* (i). Accordingly we are told (k), *That in the Eighteenth Year of King Jeroboam, Abijam began to reign over Judah; and that he reigned three Years in Jerusalem.* In the Foot of Pag. 139. you have the following Note, that it is said, 2 Chron. xxi. 3, *That Jehosaphat gave the Kingdom to Jehoram, because he was the First-born.* But to what Purpose is this Note? Does it shew that the other Fourteen Kings of Judah did succeed by the Right of Primogeniture, when I have demonstrated that *Abijam*, one of the Fifteen Kings of Judah, did not succeed by that Right?

You make the Monarchy of Judah, from *Solomon* to *Josiah*, to be strictly hereditary by Proximity of Blood, and the Right of Primogeniture. But having shewed you that *Abijam*, the second Monarch from *Solomon*, did not succeed by a direct hereditary

(i) 2 Chron. xi. 18—23. (k) Chap. xiii. 1, 2.

tary Succession; it necessarily follows, that the hereditary Right was by him defeated by his Succession, and his Descendents succeeding one after another; for the Right never returned to any of the three elder Sons of *Rehoboam*, nor to any descending from them: They were for ever shut out and kept out from the Succession.

You give us another Position; and assert, "That after *Josiah* indeed, the People made *Jehoahaz* his second Son King; but for ought appears contrary to God's Appointment." Here I must ask you, what you understand by the Words, *God's Appointment*? Is the Meaning of them, the Divine Institution or Law, and that there is a Law instituting strict and absolute hereditary Monarchy, binding for ever on all Societies and Communities of Men in the World, or any one Community of Men in it? You'll oblige all the Republicks and Commonwealths in *Europe*, by making the grand Discovery, that they may change the Aristocratical Form for the Monarchical; that they may no more sin against such a Law and Institution: Or, do you understand by God's Appointment, the Order of Succession to the Kingdom of *Judah*: But the Order of Succession to *David* by *Salomon*, was not by Proximity of Blood, or the Right

Right of Primogeniture; neither was the Succession of *Abijam* to *Rehoboam* by the said Right. *Rehoboam* did succeed *Solomon* by the Right of Primogeniture; But was the Order of Succession by the Right of Primogeniture then established? But you see that this is not probable, for *Rehoboam* did not regard it; so that the Order of Succession being so various by God himself; it can't be said that any one Order was fixt by a Divine Appointment. You say *Jeboahas*, the second Son of *Josiah*, his succeeding his Father, does appear to be contrary to the Divine Appointment: But surely it can no more be contrary to it, than *Abijam*, the fourth Son of his Father, his succeeding his Father *Rehoboam*. You assert, that the Fifteen Kings from *Solomon* to *Josiah*, were of God's Appointment; your Meaning must be, that they had the strict hereditary Right: But I have made it evident, that *Abijam* had it not.

You stop at *Josiah*, when you give an Account of the hereditary Succession of the Kings of *Judah*: But pray, For what Reason? Were there not other four Kings of *Judah*, of the Posterity of *David*, *Jeboabaz*, *Jehojakim*, *Jehojachin*, and *Zedekias*, the Posterity of *Josias*, and consequently of *David*? And do you not assert, That
God

(87)

God himself entailed the Kingdom of *Judah* on the Posterity of *David*, till the Monarchy came to an End in the Days of *Nebuchadnezzar*? The Four last Kings did succeed to the Kingdom, being of the Posterity by vertue of the Entail by God himself to *David's* Posterity; and yet you question if they succeeded by the Appointment of God.

I suspect that the Reasons why you stop at *Josiah*, are, *first*, Because *Jehoaabaz* was not his eldest Son, and so did not succeed by the strict hereditary Right. *Jehojakim* was his First-born, as you think: And, *secondly*, Because *Zedekiah*, *Jehojakim's* Brother, succeeded, and not a Son, tho' he had Sons. As to the first, if the Entail of the Kingdom of *Judah* to *David's* Posterity was by God himself, then it was by Divine Appointment; and then the Entail was made to *David's* Posterity by Divine Appointment; it must necessarily follow, that whoever he was of that Entail that did succeed, he did succeed by the Divine Appointment: And the same may be replied as to the second.

I must own, that as to the Succession of the Four last Kings of *Judah*, there are Difficulties, which have perplexed Expositors;

tors ; so that there are different Sentiments. I observe, that you call *Jehoahaz* the second Son of *Josiah* ; and that you make mention only of three Sons of *Josiah*. As to the first of these, if *Jehoahaz* was the second Son of *Josiah*, then *Jehojakim* the Father of *Jehoahaz* was *Josiah*'s First-born, or his eldest Son. But here you expressly contradict the sacred Writings ; for, in *1 Chron. iii. 15.* *Jehojakim* is called *Josiah*'s second Son. The Words are : *And the Sons of Josiah were, the First-born Johanan, the second Jehojakim, the third Zedekiah, the fourth Shallum.* Now, since *Johanan* was the First-born, *Jehojakim* must have been the second ; if *Jehojakim* was *Josiah*'s second Son, *Jehoahaz* could not be the second Son. Some Interpreters, I own, say, that the Name *Johanan* is another Name that *Jehoahaz* had ; and so *Jehojakim* is called also *Eliakim*, *2 Kings xxiii. 34.* and *Zedekiah* was likewise called *Mattaniah*, *2 Kings xxiv. 17.* But then, the Difficulty is, How *Johanan*, who they say is the same with *Jehoahaz*, can be called *Josiah*'s First-born ? To this they make this Answer, that he is called *Josiah*'s First-born, as he was the first King of all the Sons of *Josiah* ; the People preferred him to his elder Brother, being of a warlike Spirit, and enterprizing Genius ;

Genius ; and more fit to govern them and protect them against their Enemies, and to avenge the Death of his Father *Josiah* ; for it is said, *The People of the Land took him, and anointed him, and made him King in his Father's stead* (l). But I apprehend that this is to stretch a Text : A First-born in Scripture, for what I know, is never taken in that Sense. Again, it is certain that *Jeboahaz* was a younger Son of *Josiah* than *Jehojakim* ; for he was 23 Years old when he began to reign, and he reigned 3 Months in *Jerusalem* (m) ; and *Jehojakim*, or *Eliakim* as he is also called, was 25 Years old when he was made King (n) ; there being but three Months betwixt the Reign of the one and the other.

It being now evident, that *Johanan* was another Son of *Josiah* than *Jeboahaz*, it was expected from you, that you would have given us a Note touching his being called *Josiah's* First-born, since you took Care to observe, that *Jehoram* is called *Jehosaphat's* First-born (o). I give you my Opinion concerning *Johanan* ; I think that he never came to be King of *Judah*, that he died before his Father *Josiah*, and therefore, for this Reason, he is not recorded among the
M Kings

(l) 2 Kings xxiii. 30. (m) Ver. 31. (n) Ib. V. 36.
(o) Ans. P. 139.

Kings of Judah, 2 Kings xxiii. This is the Sentiment of Bishop Patrick and other Commentators upon the Text ; and then as *Jehoahaz*, whom you, contrary to the sacred Writings, call *Josiah's* second Son, I much incline to think that he was *Josiah's* youngest Son ; that he was all one with *Shallum*, who is called (p) *Josiah's* fourth Son : For the Account we have of *Jehoahaz* (q) is, *That Pharaoh-necho put him in Bands at Riblah, in the Land of Hamath, that he might not reign in Jerufalem.* Now, this exactly agrees with what is related of *Shallum* by the Prophet *Jeremiah* (r) ; *For thus saith the Lord touching Shallum, the Son of Josiah, King of Judah, which reigned in stead of Josiah his Father, which went forth out of this Place, He shall not return thither any more : But he shall die in the Place whither they have led him Captive, and shall see this Land no more.*

As for *Jehojakim*, called also *Eliakim*, he was the second Son of *Josiah* ; He was made King by Pharaoh-necho, in the Room of *Josiah his Father* (s). You, Sir, remark touching him (t), “ That after he had “ enjoyed the Kingdom eleven Years, Ne-
buchadnezzar

(p) 1 Chron. iii. 15. (q) 2 Kings xxiii. 33. (r) Chap. xxii. 11, 12. (s) 2 Kings xxiii. 34. (t) Answ. P. 139.

"buchadnezzar carried him to *Babylon*." But, are you sure of this? You seem to have trusted, without Examination, to the Contents of *Chap. xxxvi.* of the 2d Book of the *Chronicles*, according to some Copies of the Bible; where it is said, that *Jehojakim*, reigning ill, is carried bound into *Babylon*: But, if you'll give Attention to *ver. 6.* you'll find, that it is only said, *That against him came up Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon, and bound him in Fetters, to carry him to Babylon.* This he intended; but Interpreters, not without Reason, think that he did not put it into Execution: They say, he either changed his Mind, and suffered him to reign in *Jerusalem* as his Vassal, holding the Crown of him, and paying him Homage for it; or, that he died in *Jerusalem*, which prevented the carrying him Captive to *Babylon*; for we read, *2 Kings xxiv. 6.* *That he slept with his Fathers, i. e. he was buried with them in Jerusalem.* We read particularly of his Father *Josiah*, that he was buried there (u). *Pharaoh-necho slew Josiah at Megiddo, and his Servants carried him in a Chariot, dead from Megiddo, and brought him to Jerusalem, and buried him in his own Sepulchre,*

M 2

You

(u) 2 Kings xxiii. 29, 30,

You say truly, P. 139, That after *Jehojakim*, *Jehojachin*, his Son, came to be King: But consider, that you except them both from being Kings of God's Appointment. But I cannot see any Reason for it: For, as I observed, *Johanan*, the eldest Son, died before his Father, and *Jehoabaz* reigned but three Months; *Jehojakim* was the eldest, and *Jehojachin* his Son succeeded him. So that these two Kings should not be excepted: The Father succeeded *Josiah*, and *Jehojachin*, the Son, succeeded him: After *Jehojachin* there was indeed an Interruption: This *Jehojachin* had another Name; he is called, *Matth. i. 22*, *Jeconias*, and by the Prophet *Jeremiah*, he is called *Coniah* (x); *Nebuchadnezzar*, probably out of Contempt, took away the first Syllable of his Name. The Prophet, speaking of him, tells us (z), *That the Lord said, write this Man childless*: The Meaning is, not that he had no Children (for we have no fewer than Seven of his Sons mentioned, 1 *Chr. iii. 17, 18.*) but the Sense is, Let none of his Posterity be entered upon Record, in the Roll of the Succession of the Kings of *Judah*: And so the Prophet (a) explains it; *No Man of his Seed shall prosper, sitting on the Throne of David, and ruling any more* in

(x) Chap. xxii. 24. (z) Jer. xxii. 30. (a) Ibid,

in Judah. Thus you see, That, tho' God entailed, on the Posterity of David, the Kingdom of Judah, God would not suffer the Sons of *Jehojachin* to succeed: Thus an End again is put to the direct hereditary Succession: His Uncle *Zedekiah*, his Father's Brother, succeeded him; and all the Right he had was from the King of *Babylon* (b); and yet he is called the Anointed of the Lord (c), *The Breath of our Nostrils, the Anointed of the Lord was taken in their Pits, of whom we said, under his Shadow we shall live among the Heathen.* So he is called, tho', by the direct hereditary Succession, the eldest Son of *Jehojachin* should have succeeded: And tho' the Prophet calls him, *The Anointed of the Lord*, yet he is one of these you except from succeeding by the divine Appointment and Designation. Strange! the Entail of the Kingdom of Judah is to the Posterity of David: *Zedekiah* is one of that Posterity, being a Son of good King *Josiah*; and he was the anointed of the Lord, and yet you except him from being a King by God's Appointment and Designation. You have an Observation on the anointing of *Solomon*: It is said of him (d), *That the Congregation anointed him to the Lord*; your

(b) 2 Kings xxiv. 18. (c) Lam. iv. 20. (d) 1 Chr. xxix. 22.

Observation is (e), That it plainly imports, that he was the Lords Anointed, and not the People's; and his Vicegerent, and not theirs: And yet, when *Zedekiah* is by the Prophet *Jeremiah*, in the foresaid Text, called, *The Anointed of the Lord*; which plainly imports, That he was the Lord's Anointed, and his Vicegerent: You except him from being King of *Judah* by God's Appointment and Designation.

You often lay great Stress on this, That some Kings of *Judah* are called the Lord's Anointed: And say here is a *jure divino* King, if ever there was one: And when it is said (f) of *Solomon*, *That the Congregation anointed Solomon to the Lord*; your Comment is, that it plainly imports, that he was the Lord's Anointed, and not the People's, Strange! For if the People anointed him, he was their Anointed: For the Congregation knowing that King *David*, and *Nathan* the Prophet, had managed the Affair, that *Solomon* should succeed his Father; they concluded that this was by the overruling Providence of God, and in this respect it is said that they anointed him to the Lord, i. e. they acquiesced and agreed to it by using this Rite.

And now, Sir, you'll allow me to offer some

(e) *Anf. P.* 138. (f) *Chron.* xxix, 22.

some of my Thoughts on the anointing of some Kings to your Consideration; nay, I have the Vanity to say for your Instruction: For you give no Evidence that you have studied this Matter.

1. I know that some Authors, to establish the *Jure-divino-ship* of Monarchy, have brought an Argument for it, from *Psal. cv. 15. Touch not mine Anointed, and do my Prophets no Harm.* This Text has been used, especially by Court Divines, to flatter Kings; applying the first Clause, *Touch not mine Anointed*, to them: They must not be touched, nor any Harm done to them, because they are the Lord's Anointed. But tho' I own that the Persons of Kings, nay of inferior Rulers and Magistrates, are sacred, and Injuries must not be offered to them; yet this Text does not speak concerning Monarchs. You would know that the inspired Penman of this Psalm was King David; for compare from ver. 1. to 16. with 1 *Chron. xvi. 7.—27.* you'll find it said, *That David delivered first this Psalm to thank the Lord, into the Hand of Asaph and his Brethren.* In it he commemorates, the Divine Care and Protection of the Fathers of the Israelites, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and their Families, *when they were few in Number, yea very few, and Strangers in the Land*

Land of Canaan, and when they went from one Nation to another, from one Kingdom to another People. The Divine Protection of them, when they were not able to defend themselves, was so great, that he suffered no Man to do them Wrong; yea, he reprov'd Kings for their Sakes, saying, Touch not mine Anointed. He calls these three Patriarchs his Messiahs, *i. e.* his Anointed, or Christs: And God charged Kings to do them no Wrong. Those Patriarchs were not Kings, they had not Kingdoms, Principalities and Territories: They are indeed in Scripture called Patriarchs, not that they had any Monarchical Authority, but only in respect of that Authority they had over their own Families. Kings were charged to do them no Hurt, when they sojourned among them. Pharaoh was by God rebuked and punished with Plagues for taking Sarah Abraham's Wife: Thus he was compelled to restore her to her Husband, Gen. xii. 10. to the End. For the same Reason God rebuked Abimelech King of Gerar, Gen. xx. *per totum*: Thus likewise Isaac and his Wife were protected; for the same Abimelech, Gen. xxvi. 11. charged all his People, saying, He that toucheth this Man or his Wife, shall surely be put to Death. It is plain and certain,

certain, that King *David* had an Eye to these Passages, when he tells us God charged Kings not to touch his Anointed; and these Patriarchs the Psalmist had mentioned *ver. 9th and 10th.* They are called Messiahs, or Christs, *i. e.* anointed Ones; not that they were anointed with any material Oil; but as God had consecrated, and set them apart to himself, by the Gifts and Graces of his Spirit. Thus also our Saviour is called the Messiah, *which is interpreted, the Christ, χριστος, John i. 41. Marg. the Anointed.* And it is certain, that Christ was not anointed with any material Oil for entering upon his Office, but *with the Holy Ghost, Acts x. 30. and that above his Fellows, Psal. xlv. 7.* 2^{dly}, I shall entertain you with an Observation of the Learned Dutch Annotations on *2 Kings xi. 12.* where it is said, *That Jehojada brought forth the King's Son, and put the Crown upon him, and gave him the Testimony; and they made him King, and anointed him.* It is, "That those who
 " succeed their Fathers in the Kingdom,
 " according to the usual Manner, were not
 " anointed; but only those that after some
 " Change in the Government, or above
 " the ordinary Law, or thro' Fear of future
 " Trouble, were crowned Kings, as
 " *Saul, 1 Sam. x. 1. David, 1 Sam. xvi. 13.*

Solomon, 1 Kings i. 34. *Jehu*, 2 Kings ix. 6. *Jehoahaz*, 2 Kings xxiii. 30. and *Joash*, 2 Kings xi. 12. It is true that these Divines were Men of Republican Principles: But it is no Matter who make the Observation, if what is said is well founded. I call them Learned Divines: For their Translation of the Bible, is judged by many to be the best Extant. I do not pretend to understand their Language, but you have their Translation converted into our Language, and likewise their Notes done by *Theodore Haack*.

And I have been at Pains to compare it with ours done by the Divines of the Nomination of King *James VI*. And when I compare both with the Originals, the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, I find theirs better: Of this I am able to give you many Instances.

But tho' this King *Joash* was anointed, yet it seems that *Jehojada* the Priest did not perform the Ceremony: For the Actions of the Priest, were the putting the Crown on his Head, and the giving him the Testimony, i. e. the Book of the Law, according to which he was to regulate his Administration: But as to the anointing of him; this seems to have been done by others; for it is said in the Plural Number, and they anointed him: And the Reason of it, appears to have been the

In-

Interruption of the Succession by the Government of *Athaliah*, who tyrannized over them the Space of Six Years. I must likewise entertain you with another Observation, and it is a Note of the famous Mr. *Robert Douglas*, who preached the Sermon at *Scoon*, at the Coronation of King *Charles II.* January 1. 1651; the Observation is touching *Joash*: He says, "It is the Con-
 " jecture of good Interpreters, that tho'
 " *Joash* is called the Son of King *Ahaziah*,
 " yet he was not his Son by Nature, but
 " by Succession to the Crown: They say
 " that the Race of *Solomon* ceased here, and
 " the Kingdom came to the Posterity of
 " *Nathan* the Son of *David*, because,
 " 2 *Chron.* xxii. 9. it is said, *The House of*
 " *Ahaziah* had no Power to keep still the
 " Kingdom; which they conceive to have
 " been for want of Children in that House,
 " and because of the Absurdity and Unna-
 " turalness of the Facts of *Athaliah* the
 " Grandmother, in cutting of her Son's
 " Children." If this Observation shall hold,
 it shews, that in the Kingdom, the Suc-
 cession went not always from Father to Son.
 The Authority of so great a Divine, with
 his good Interpreters, makes me to doubt
 of your Assertion (g), namely, that *Joash*
 N 2 was

was the true and righteous Heir, by the Appointment of God himself.

Saul, David, Solomon, Jehoahaz, Kings of *Judah*, and *Jehu* King of *Israel*, were anointed, and yet were not Kings by Birth. You'll consider concerning *David*, which you seem not to have adverted to, that he is often called the Anointed of the Lord, and that he was by the Divine Nomination a King; and yet this Divine Right, all the Time that he was King of *Judah*, as a separate Kingdom, for more than Six Years, was contrary to another Divine Right, as you call it, the Right that *Ishbosheth* had, as the Son of *Saul* to be King over *Israel*. The Ten Tribes went upon this Consideration, when they took him to be their King: Nay, God in his Providence, in many Instances, has defeated this strict hereditary Right, and disregarded it; so that the Bible, in my Opinion, is the chief Book from which irrefragable Arguments for exposing it can be brought.

3. I would have you to consider with Attention, that there is no Precept or Command in the Scripture, given to any Nation or Kingdom in the World, to anoint their Kings at their Accession to the Throne. There is no express Law in-
joining

joining it; so that it was not necessary to use this Rite; many of the Kings of *Judah* were not anointed, and none of the Kings of *Israel* were anointed but *Jehu*: Had it been necessary, these Kings would have taken Care to be anointed. And nothing is recorded about it in the New Testament. *Jeroboam* the first King of *Israel*, who had not a Right by Birth to be their King, would no doubt have sought this Anointing, had he thought it necessary. God indeed said to the Prophet *Elijah* (a), Anoint *Hazael* to be King over *Syria*. But this was only done to him, to be a Sign that he should succeed *Benhadad* King of *Syria*: This is evident, by comparing this Text with *2 Kings* viii. 13. where the Prophet *Elisba* said to him; *The Lord hath shewed me that thou shalt be King over Syria*; i. e. the Lord by the Spirit of Prophecy hath enabled me to foretel this Event. Will you make the Inference from this Prediction, that he was a *Jure-divino* King? especially, since the Prophet notified to him the Cruelties he would be guilty of to the Children of *Israel*; *Their young Men wilt thou slay with the Sword, and dash their Children, and rip up their Women with Child*: If this Man was a *Jure-divino* King, take him to you. Again,

(a) 1 Kings xix. 15.

21—8. xi. 36. (b)

gain, it is certain, that the Word ANOINTING, is used concerning a Person who was not anointed, and, consequently, can signify no more than the Designation of him to the Office and Dignity. *Isa. xlv. 1. Thus saith the Lord to his Anointed, to Cyrus, whose Right-hand I have holden to subdue Nations.* These Words were uttered 200 Years before Cyrus was born, before which Time he could not be anointed: It might have been properly translated, *Thus saith the Lord of Cyrus his Anointed.* We read of the anointing of a King long before any of the Kings you mention to be of God's Nomination: *Jotham* the Son of *Jerubaal*, or, as he is called, *Gideon*, in his Parable, makes mention of this Rite 200 Years before the Days of King *Saul* (b); *The Trees went forth on a Time to anoint a King over them, and they said unto the Olive-tree, Reign thou over us.* The same was said to the Fig-tree, and to the Vine; but they all refused to accept: But when they said to the Bramble, *Come thou, and reign over us;* the Bramble said, *If in Truth ye anoint me King over you, then come, and put your Trust under my Shadow.* By this we learn, that the Custom of anointing Kings at first, was not derived from God: So that,

(b) *Judg. ix. 8,—16.*

that, when the People of *Israel* desired to have a King like to those of other Nations, who were anointed, God in his Anger granted their Desire, and said to *Samuel* his Prophet (a), *Thou shalt anoint Saul to be Captain over my People Israel*. This being the Occasion of using this Rite to a King of God's Nomination, can be no Evidence that it made their Persons sacred, especially in your Sense, and the Writers of your *Kidney*, for the *Jure-divino-ship* of hereditary Monarchy; namely, that they are so sacred, tho' they should reign arbitrarily and tyrannically, contrary to the Laws which should govern them, as well as the Subjects; they ought, for no Acts of Tyranny whatsoever, to be resisted, or called to give an Account. After *Zedekiah*, the last King of *Judah*, this Rite was, for a long Time, in Desuetude, till the *Popes* of *Rome* usurped a Dominion over crowned Heads, then to establish their Greatness, and to make Kings and Emperors to depend upon them, and to keep them in Subjection to them, revived it, and made it necessary.

4thly, You'll permit me to make another Observation, that the great Variety in the performing of this Ceremony, is a shrewd

Evi-

(a) 1 Sam. ix. 16.

Evidence, that it was not of divine Institution: For, if God had appointed it to be used always when Persons came to the Throne, he would have given his Directions to be observed in the doing of it. But nothing like this is to be met with in the sacred Records: *Saul* was anointed in a very private Manner, none being present but a Servant, who was bid to pass on before them, till *Samuel* anointed *Saul*. And so was *David*, even when *Saul* was alive (*b*); *Samuel* took an Horn of Oil, and anointed him in the Midst of his Brethren. Bishop *Patrick* observes, that it might be translated, *From among his Brethren*; he singled him out from the rest, that he might do it secretly. Those, who had no Birth-right, were anointed as *Saul*, *David* and *Solomon*; and these Kings of *Judah*, who had the Proximity of Blood to their Fathers, were not anointed. Sometimes this Ceremony was performed by a Prophet; so *Samuel* anointed *Saul* and *David*: Sometimes by a Priest; so *Zadok* anointed *Solomon*; Sometimes the People did it; so *Joash* was anointed by them: Sometimes by common Oil, as *Saul* and *David*, by *Samuel*; and once we read, that one was anointed by the Oil of the Sanctuary.

Lastly,

(*b*) 1 Sam. xvi. 13.

Lastly, The Persons of Kings are sacred; so that no Violence is to be offered to them; not by the Rite of anointing, but by the Authority that they are invested with, to rule and govern for the Good and Interest of their Subjects. But then, the Persons of inferior Magistrates, for the same Reason, are sacred, and no Harm or Violence is to be offered to them. All Rulers have the Thing, *i. e.* Authority; this it is that makes their Persons sacred, tho' they want anointing: The anointing of them had as little of a Sacramental Signification, as the Extreme Unction of the Church of *Rome*.

These are the Observations I offer to your Consideration, on the Custom of anointing of Kings.

From what I have advanced on your Pages, *viz.* from P. 136—140; you must now see, (1) The many Interruptions in the Succession to the Kingdom of *Judah*; so that it is absurdly by you called a direct hereditary Succession; (2) Your Contradictions, to express Texts of Scripture; (3) Your perverting them by your false and absurd Comments upon them; (4) Your frequent contradicting yourself; and, *lastly*, Your betraying and giving up the Cause

Cause you have been contending for: So that I fancy you will now repent, that you have engaged in the Dispute from the sacred Writings; you hop'd they would give you Assistance, but you have met with a Disappointment.

In P. 139, you are so kind, as to make me a Royal Present; "As for the Kings of Israel, from *Jeroboam* to *Hoshea*, you say, "Let our Author take them to him, and "bring them to the Throne which Way "he pleaseth." I return you the Compliment, and make you a Present of the many Kings of *Judah*; for you assert (*h*), "That the sacred History informs us, that "many of those Kings were very foolish "and wicked Men." Nay, they were as bad as the wicked Kings of *Israel*, and guilty of the same Impieties and Abominations, that they were guilty of: I will name them to you; *Rehoboam*, *Abijam*, *Jehoram* the Son of *Jehosaphat*, *Joash*, *Amaziah* the Son of *Joash*, *Abaz* the Son of *Jotham*. *Manasseh*, *Jehojakim*, *Jehoiah*, *Zedekiah*, *Jehoiachin* or *Shallum*: Take them all to you. You own, that the first Seven were Kings of God's Appointment and Designation; and tho' they had the divine Appointment, as you say, they were not in the

the least the better of it: *Corruptio optimi pessima*. Nay, I make you the Compliment of *Saul*, the first King of all *Israel*, who was the Lord's Anointed, as well as *Zedekiah*: Thus you have the round Dozen; take them all to you.

You add, in P. 140, "That, if the People had the chief Hand in their Advancement, they were very unlucky in their Choice." But, Sir, I ask you, If the Seven Kings I mentioned before *Josiah*, whom you call *Jure-divino* Kings, were any better of the divine Appointment you speak of? You say, of the Kings of *Israel*, That, from *Jeroboam* to *Hoshea*, there was not one good King among them all: And since you say of many of the Kings of *Judah*, that they were foolish and wicked; surely this does not recommend Monarchical Government, as the fittest to promote the Happiness of publick Societies and Communities of Men; and when you added, that this is confirmed by the Experience of all Ages, you advanced a gross Falshood.

You assert, (i) "That none of the Kings of *Israel* was appointed by God, but one." This is another Falshood. I suppose you mean King *Jehu*, because you say,

O 2

That

" That he was appointed for the punishing
 " the Wickedness of his two Predecessors."
 This is another Falshood. I am not a little
 surprized, that you are so unacquainted
 with the Scripture Records: For *Jeroboam*,
 the Son of *Nebat*, who made *Israel* to sin,
 had the divine Appointment to be King
 over *Israel*, as much as *Jehu* had it. Turn
 to the xi. Chapter of the 1 Book of *Kings*,
 and you'll find, that *Abijah*, a Prophet of
 the Lord, notified to him the divine Ap-
 pointment and Designation of him to be
 King of the ten Tribes: He did this by
 a most significant Sign, viz. the rending of
 a Garment into twelve Pieces, and giving
 him Ten, thereby assuring him, that he
 should be King of ten Tribes of *Israel*. This
 Assurance he gave him in the Name of the
 God of *Israel*, by whom Kings reign; v.
 31. *For thus saith the Lord the God of Israel,*
behold I will rend the Kingdom out of the
Hand of Solomon, and will give ten Tribes
unto thee: This is the Explication of the
 Text; and again, to make it more certain,
 v. 35. *I will take the Kingdom out of his*
Hand, and give to thee ten Tribes: And, as
 if these Intimations had not been sufficient
 to ascertain to him that Kingdom, the Pro-
 phet, to give him a Plerophory, made
 the

the Intimation to him a third Time, v. 37. *And I will take thee, according to all that thy Soul desireth, and thou shalt be King over Israel:* Nay, God entailed the Kingdom upon him, and his Descendents, much after the same Manner he had entailed the Kingdom of all *Israel* upon *David* and his Posterity, conditionally, and with the same Limitation, *Quamdiu se bene gesserint.* V. 38, *And it shall be, if thou wilt hearken to all (i. e. obey all) that I shall command thee, and wilt walk in my Ways, and do that is right in my Sight, to keep my Statutes and Commandments, as David my Servant did, that I will be with thee, and build thee a sure House, as I have built for David, and give Israel to thee.* Can there be an Appointment conceived in stronger Terms? Further, you'll compare the foresaid Text with 1 *Kings* viii. 25. 2 *Chron.* vi. 16. and *Psal.* cxxxii. 11, 12,

And now having performed my Promise, of making a Reply to what you have advanced in your Answer to my first Treatise on Government, on the *Jure-divino-ship* of strictly hereditary Monarchical Government; I have the Vanity to think, that I have given you the Finish-

ing Stroke as to this Part of the Dispute likewise. And bidding you heartily Farewel,

I am,

LEARNED SIR,

With great Esteem

and Respect,

Your most humble Servant,

Edinburgh, May

GEORGE LOGAN.

1743.

P O S T S C R I P T.

S I R,

YOU'LL add what follows to P. 69, L. 16, after the Word, *Right*. Having shown, that the Copy of the Act of Parliament 1373, entailing the Crown to the Sons of *Robert II.* by his two Wives, *Elisabeth Mair* and *Eupham Ross*, which *Sir George Mackenzie* sent to the Earl of *Clarendon*, is a downright Forgery, by keeping out of it the many strong Clauses excluding all Females from the Succession to the

the Crown of *Scotland*: Likewise, that the Copy you found in Sir *Lewis Stewart's* Collections, which you did contend to be genuine, is a gross Forgery, as it wants the *ratio legis*, upon which it is founded; for it excludes Females from the Succession, because of the Mischief and Damages that have fallen out, in most Kingdoms, by such Succession. And finally, having shown, that the Copy lately discovered in some Place near to the *Laigh Parliament-house*, is either a Forgery, or, if genuine, that it was enacted by a very unfrequent or peckt Meeting, and that it has been carefully suppressed for some Centuries; as what the Managers in the Administration were always ashamed of, and never durst make publick. I now make the following Observation to you, That, as you, and other Writers of the same Stamp with yourself, assert, that the Earl of *Murray's* Ambition, in aspiring after the Crown, spirited him up to make so great Opposition to *Queen Mary*, as he did: So others have asserted, That it was from the same View, that the Earl of *Arran* encouraged and headed those Patriots, that were for our Reformation from the Church of *Rome* (which you and your Friends stigmatize by the Name

of *Popery* and *Superstition*)

of Rebellion.) Now, Sir, had this Pretender to the Crown known, that there was such an Act of Parliament, excluding, by the strongest Clauses (that the *Latin* Tongue can furnish) all Females; Is it to be thought, but that he, and his powerful Party, would have advanced this Topick for enforcing his Claim? Nay, had the Reformers known there was such an Act, it is not to be questioned, but they would have supported him in it; especially since *Elisabeth*, Queen of *England*, and the Reformers then, would have encouraged the Claim of a Protestant to our Crown, for such was his Profession at that Time. But further, had *John Knox* known, when he wrote his *first Blast*, &c. (an unanswerable Performance against the Regal Government of Women) he was so able a Reasoner, as to push home the Argument from this Act of Parliament, laying aside all Females from the Succession to our Crown. It is a mere Jest for you, to advance, that the Estates made Queen *Mary* our Queen, because the Male Heirs were all extinct, as I hear you do. Do you not know, that King *James V.* had once an Intention to declare the Earl of *Lennox* (who had Royal Blood running in his Veins) his Heir? Again, had not the Earl of *Arran* Royal Blood running in his?

And

And was it not contested betwixt them, which of them should be Governor, or Regent, during the Queen's Minority? The same Contest might have arisen betwixt them, as did arise betwixt the *Baliol* and the *Bruce*, who were of the collateral Line; the Females, from whom they descended, never were in the Possession of the Right: *Baliol* was first made our King; and afterwards, upon a Turn of Affairs, *Bruce* was made King. And you may remember I once told you, You was once of the Sentiment, that *Baliol* had the Right, which you have never refused; tho' now, in your late Performance, you contend, that *Bruce* had it, upon new Light, or rather new Darkness. And I am the more confirmed as to the Truth of the said Allegiance, that in your *Series Regum Scotiae Chronologica*, P. 88, you say, of *Robert Bruce*, the Grandson of him who competed for the Kingdom, *Sceptro Scotiae, 25 die Martii, Anno 1306, arrepto, &c.* Now *Arripio* signifies to seize on any Thing by Force or Violence, to make one's Self Master of a Thing by any Means. If then *Bruce* seized on the Crown of Scotland violently at that Time, certainly he had no just Right to it. I am the more confirmed in this,

P.

as

as it is the very same Phrase you use, P. 87,
with respect to *Duncanus II. Malcolm's Ba-*
stard-Brother, and an Usurper; Dun-
canus ille, ejus nominis II. regnum ejecto
(ut diximus) Donaldò Bano, arripuit.

FINIS.



ERRATA.

PAGE 9, Line 25, after the Word *as* add *it*. P. 21,
L. 21, dele the *Comma* after *Dionysius*. P. 33,
L. 6, read *Major*. Ib. L. 11, dele *συγγενῶν*, and for
it put *Σύμ*.